



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

[Doctoral Dissertations](#)

[Graduate School](#)

8-2020

Use of Direct Quotes in the Literature Reviews of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations: A Qualitative Case Study of L2 Graduate Students

Romana Hinton

University of Tennessee, rrousko1@vols.utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss

Recommended Citation

Hinton, Romana, "Use of Direct Quotes in the Literature Reviews of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations: A Qualitative Case Study of L2 Graduate Students. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2020.

https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/6805

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Romana Hinton entitled "Use of Direct Quotes in the Literature Reviews of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations: A Qualitative Case Study of L2 Graduate Students." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in English.

Tanita Saenkhum, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Kirsten Benson, Jeffrey M. Ringer, Thorsten Huth

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**Use of Direct Quotes in the Literature Reviews of Master's Theses and Doctoral
Dissertations: A Qualitative Case Study of L2 Graduate Students**

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Romana Hinton
August 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This doctoral dissertation would not have completed without the continuous support of my dissertation advisor, friends, and family. First, I would like to thank my dissertation advisor, Dr. Tanita Saenkhum, who offered constructive feedback on all my drafts and worked with me through one-on-one in-person sessions and, more recently, endless Zoom meetings. Most importantly, I am thankful to her for pushing me to become a better writer, reader, and thinker. Without her mentorship, I would not have been able to pursue this project.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee members, Dr. Kirsten Benson, Dr. Jeffrey Ringer, and Dr. Thorsten Huth, and my editor, Kristina McCue, for their helpful comments and advice. I also would like to express my gratitude to my whole family, especially to my mother-in-law and my husband for reading most of my drafts. I could not have accomplished this work without their constant help and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank the dedicated student participants. This dissertation truly would not have happened without the voluntary participation of each of them. It is my hope that this work will provide understanding and assistance for other L2 graduate students who follow their path.

ABSTRACT

This study examines how L2 graduate students, specifically international graduate students in social science disciplines, learn about direct quoting and the use of direct quotes in the literature reviews of theses and dissertations. The study utilizes the theoretical framework of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to observe the way L2 graduate students as newcomers in the periphery of their disciplines learn about and use direct quotes in formal and informal teaching settings in both their home countries and U.S. universities. At the same time, the study investigates to what extent L2 graduate students' understanding of the use of direct quotes in literature reviews allows them to establish themselves as more experienced members of their disciplines. Drawing from the experiences of student participants in learning and using direct quotes, the study provides practical implications for graduate programs working with L2 graduate students and recommendations for future research on direct quoting. Semi-structured interviews and text-based interviews with four L2 graduate students between Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville explored direct quoting and the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations. The text-based interviews were based on textual analyses of students' literature review drafts.

The study's findings show that in order for L2 graduate students to use direct quotes appropriately in literature reviews of theses and dissertations, they must obtain transparent and legitimate access to learning about direct quoting in literature reviews from L2 writing specialists, advisors, and professors in their disciplines. In the context of

the study, most participants entered graduate programs with very limited experience in English academic writing and direct quoting in academic genres. As they embarked on their studies at U.S. universities and began to write their theses and dissertations, they were still hampered by difficulties in the use of direct quotes in the literature review sections.

Building on these findings, it is clear that more attention should be devoted to teaching direct quoting and literature review writing in theses and dissertation, particularly for L2 graduate students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One Introduction	1
Overview of Chapters	8
Chapter Two Literature Review	10
The Theoretical Framework of Legitimate Peripheral Participation.....	11
Community of Practice and Legitimate Peripheral Participation.....	12
Transparency and Legitimacy	15
Learning to Use Sources in Literature Reviews	18
Writing from Sources and Source Use.....	19
LPP and a Community of Practice in L2 Graduate Writing Studies.....	25
Occluded Features of Literature Reviews Writing	30
Chapter Three Methods	36
Research Settings and Context	40
Research Population and Participants Selection.....	41
Data Collection.....	43
Demographic Sheets.....	43
Interviews	44
Semi-structured Interviews	44
Text-based Interviews.....	45
Textual Analyses.....	46
Data Analysis.....	48
Semi-structured Interviews.....	49
Text-based Interviews	50
Textual Analyses.....	51
Coding of Literature Reviews Drafts	52
Inter-coder Reliability	53
Chapter Four Learning from the Peripheral to Center: Use of Direct Quotes in Literature Reviews.....	57
How L2 Graduate Students Learn About Source Use in Literature Reviews in Their Home Countries	58
Learning in Formal Teaching Settings in Their Home Countries	60
Learning in Informal Teaching Settings in Their Home Countries	65
How L2 Graduate Students Learn About Literature Reviews of Theses and Dissertations at U.S. Universities	69
Learning in Informal Teaching Settings at U.S. Universities	71
Learning in Fomral Teaching Settings at U.S. Universities	78
What L2 Graduate Students Do When They Use Source, Including, Direct Quotes in Literature Review.....	81
Reading to Learn to Write in Direct Quotes	82
Conclusion	100

Chapter Five Understanding of Literature Reviews and Use of Direct Quotes among L2 Graduate Students.....	102
Reading to Learn and Writing to Learn Embedded Literature Reviews of Theses and Dissertations	103
Conclusion.....	114
Chapter Six	117
A Theoretical Discussion.....	119
A Practical Implication	122
Advisors.....	123
L2 Writing Specialist and Content Specialists in Different Disciplines.....	124
Students.....	126
Graduate Studies Directors	128
Future Research and Limitations	129
References.....	130
Appendices.....	142
Vita.....	160

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Learning how to correctly use source material through paraphrasing, summarizing, synthesizing, and direct quoting is an essential aspect of academic writing for any L2 graduate student, including those who are studying on international visas. Research on source use regards direct quoting as a simple intertextual skill that is not difficult for L2 graduate students to learn and apply into their own texts (Petric, 2012). As a result, research into the use of direct quoting has usually been excluded from studies on source use. Many studies use the term ‘source use’ for the intertextual skills of paraphrasing, synthesizing, and summarizing but not for direct quoting; however, the current study considers direct quoting to be an important part of source use when investigating the challenges for L2 graduate students.

The way L2 graduate students use sources in various academic genres is the result of their present and past learning experiences. As the scholarship on L2 graduate student writing has shown, in most cases L2 graduate students learn to use sources by immersing themselves in a “participatory practice [that] involves looking at what people do, particularly in relationship to other community [discipline] members” (Casanave, 2008, p. 17). Many studies have confirmed that L2 graduate students learn about source use in their own disciplines through formal and informal teaching settings (Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002; Casanave & Li, 2008). For example, the studies of Prior (1998) and Casanave (2002) found that L2 students learn the process of source use both from teaching settings as enculturation as well as adaptation into the new environment of their disciplines. L2 graduate students usually take a long time to learn about source use and, in the end, not all of them are able to incorporate sources effectively (Prior, 1998; Petric, 2012).

The challenges they face and their unique educational and linguistic backgrounds play important roles in this learning process and are discussed later in this chapter as well as in Chapter Two.

Studies have also examined implicit source use teaching instruction by instructors and advisors (Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002). Although there has been a trend in past three decades to bring explicitness into teaching source use through genre instruction, the focus on genre instruction has seemed to be more on structural knowledge of a genre such as the Create a Research Space (CARS) model (Swales, 1990, 2004; Swales & Feak, 2012) than on students' actual learning needs. Polio and Shi (2012) evaluated what students do when they use sources and observed that students as learners in academic settings struggle with “what to cite, how to cite, why to cite, where to cite, how often to cite, who to cite, and even when not to cite” (p. 95). Overall, these difficulties have been addressed in research on synthesizing, summarizing, and paraphrasing among L2 undergraduate students (Yang & Shi, 2003; Keck, 2006; Zhang, 2013). However, there has been less research on direct quoting in their disciplines, particularly among international L2 graduate students. To address this research gap, the current study examined how international L2 graduate students, learn how to use direct quotes in the literature reviews of theses and dissertations. Additionally, it aims to describe to what extent their understanding of how the use of direct quotes in literature reviews helps them to establish themselves as members of the scholarly community in their disciplines.

A close look at literature reviews in theses and dissertations is important because it is one of the most challenging sections of research to write, yet most students have seldom been taught to write them correctly in their own disciplines (Chen et al., 2015). The main purpose of a literature review in academic writing is to find a new value in research that is different from any previously documented research (Kwan, 2006). A literature review identifies the gap in research

and brings new perspectives into previously researched topics or introduces a completely unique topic (Bruce, 2014). It also provides the relevant literature in a research topic (Kwan, 2006), which is needed by the researcher to critically evaluate and synthesize sources into a literature review (Bruce, 2014).

Gaining critical analytical skills such as synthesizing and analyzing is essential for writing literature reviews in research (Casanave & Hubbard, 1992; Bruce, 2014). However, these skills have been found to be problematic for L2 graduate students (Casanave & Hubbard, 1992; Casanave, 2002; Bruce, 2014). These students often struggle with three types of knowledge that influence how successfully these skills are embraced: (a) propositional knowledge, (b) metadiscourse knowledge, and (c) syntactical, lexical, and structural knowledge. Propositional knowledge leads to understanding the sources and transforming them into a writer's own text. Metadiscourse knowledge permits writers to communicate their own views persuasively to readers, and syntactical, lexical, and structural knowledge rely on grammar patterns and the ways in which the text is structured (Bruce, 2014).

In addition to propositional, metadiscourse, and syntactical, lexical, and structural knowledge, writers of literature reviews have the option to quote, summarize, or paraphrase relevant source material. Of these options, direct quoting requires the writer to use the exact words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs of the source authors when building and supporting their arguments. Petric (2012) argued that direct quoting is not an easy task, and direct quoting should not be underestimated but instead should be taught more often and researched further. Critical reading and writing skills play an essential role in the choice and use of direct quotes in literature reviews. Direct quoting, along with summarizing and synthesizing, is a reading-to-write task (Plakans, 2010). According to Gebril and Plakans (2013), successful implementation

of reading-to-write tasks, particularly in literature reviews, depends on many factors for a second language writer, including reading comprehension, discourse features such “fluency, syntactic complexity, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary richness or sophistication” (Gebril & Plakans, 2013, p.10). Additionally, sociocultural features such as cultural and educational distinctiveness are essential when “students orient themselves to a text and a task of reading-to write with different levels of personal authority and conviction” (Gebril & Plakans, 2013, p. 11). Students can interpret a text differently and, therefore, come into conflict with their audience or have different cultural perspectives about how sources are used in a text through direct quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing (Gebril & Plakans, 2013).

Petric (2012) noted that studies of direct quoting are scarce, but those that exist have confirmed that students who use direct quotes in their writing must know how to incorporate a quote contextually and co-textually, which is where they can encounter problems. Negotiating a situation in which they are working with different stylistic, grammatical, and contextually situated quotes while still trying to write in their own voice can be tricky to negotiate for any student, but especially so for L2 novice writers. Students using direct quotes have a tendency to fit together their own “cognitive jig-saw puzzle pieces” (Petric, 2012, p. 103) based on their previous L1 experiences with quoting in a writing context and the source use conventions of their own disciplines. These students are unfamiliar with the conventions of source use in L2 due to the limited time they have spent in new disciplines (Petric, 2012).

Petric (2012) also observed that L2 graduate students who struggle with general knowledge of the writing conventions of their own disciplines find the use of direct quotes particularly problematic. They either overuse quotes or rely heavily on the voices of experts instead of their own (Petric, 2012). Petric’s (2012) findings also confirm that generally low-

proficiency students quote longer passages of their source texts than do students who are more experienced writers. More experienced and proficient writers tend to quote more often but use short fragments of text, field terminology, or multiple quote fragments in their sentences. Petric's study (2012) also describes L2 graduate students as being aware of illegitimate textual borrowing, which often causes them to become obsessed with careful and correct source use for fear of being accused of plagiarism. One result is that such intense focus on correct legitimate textual borrowing might prevent L2 writers from gaining their own authorial voice (Petric, 2012).

It is also important to point out that most L2 graduate students are also novices in an Anglo-American academic environment that is usually very different from what they are used to in their own countries (Flowerdew, 2000). Variations in cultural background and previous educational experience can influence how sources are used in their own academic genre (Shi, 2006; Baba, 2009; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Plakans, 2009; Zhang, 2013). For example, Shi (2006) described how Chinese students consider open and broad knowledge to be a common heritage following the Asian tradition of Confucianism use sources without crediting the authors for most of these students plagiarism is a completely new concept, and some of them consider plagiarism as a form of imitation and not as stealing someone else's work. The students in Shi's (2006) study described imitation as an appropriate and natural process of only borrowing words; they did not feel comfortable with source use as viewed by Anglo-American academia since source use had received very little attention in their own English classes in China. German students expressed similar attitudes, but also mentioned that German academia does not consider plagiarism does not consider plagiarism to be unethical so much as a problem of style (Shi, 2006).

L2 students bring prior knowledge and experiences with source use from their L1 writing in their own disciplines, but L2 graduate students in particular sometimes have to re-learn how to use sources in L2 in their own disciplines so they are able to distinguish common and specific knowledge in their discipline and, therefore, identify what must be cited (Shi, 2011). Also, L2 students are often accustomed to using direct quotes in the hard sciences mainly for short strings of words and in social sciences for longer passages or sentences (Hyland, 2000). Furthermore, students' educational backgrounds and experiences play an important role in learning about source use. For example, in their study Yang and Shi (2003) included a student whose management background benefitted a student to generate ideas for writing in business courses (Cumming et al, 2016). Also, Shi (2012) found that "such apparently straightforward academic literacy skills as paraphrasing or summarizing are, in fact, complex and depend on one's knowledge of content, the disciplinary nature of citation practices, and the rhetorical purposes of using citations in a specific context of disciplinary writing" (p. 134). Having more writing experiences and source use knowledge in their disciplines allows students to improve their thinking, reading, and composing processes so that they are able to conceptualize source-based evidence and embed it into their writing (Shi, 2012; Yang& Shi, 2003).

The challenges L2 graduate students face when they use sources through paraphrasing, synthesizing, summarizing, and direct quoting led Belcher (2006) and Benesch (2001) to urge scholars in second language writing to investigate how L2 graduate students navigate learning about source use and direct quoting in their own disciplines. Both emphasized the view that L2 graduate students have been mistakenly perceived as already fully knowledgeable writers. It is important to counter this perception by paying attention to the needs of L2 graduate students who struggle with learning about disciplinary writing conventions, source use, and direct quoting

(Benesch, 2001; Belcher, 2006; Casanave, 2008). Because L2 graduate students are usually under pressure to perform as fully developed researchers with their own voice (Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000), many of the challenges they face are overlooked by professors in their own disciplines.

To examine how L2 graduate students learn how to use direct quotes in literature reviews, this study utilized a theoretical framework of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991) situated in a community of practice (Wenger, 1998). In the context of this study, the term ‘a community of practice’ refers to students’ disciplines. LPP is a social learning theory that allowed the current project to research how L2 graduate students learn about direct quoting and use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertation from a periphery of their disciplines. L2 graduate students learn about direct quoting by observing more experienced colleagues in their disciplines. However, to be able to learn from a periphery, L2 graduate students need legitimate and transparent access to learning. The problem of legitimacy and transparency while learning to use direct quotes in literature reviews is addressed in this study as the reason L2 graduate students often struggle to use direct quotes effectively, contribute to existing research, and establish themselves as members of their disciplines. Lave and Wenger (1991) maintained that “learning involves the whole person; it implies not only a relation to social communities—it implies becoming a full participant, a member, a kind of person” (p. 35). In other words, L2 graduate students who learn about direct quoting and its use in literature reviews have a goal to contribute to their disciplines with new knowledge and to eventually become fully recognized scholars in their disciplines.

In order to examine how L2 graduate students learn about direct quoting and use direct quotes in the literature reviews of theses and dissertations, this study followed four L2 graduate

students in a discipline of social science who were writing literature reviews for theses or dissertations over the course of three semesters at a large public university. The study consists of semi-structured interviews, text-based interviews, and textual analyses of literature review drafts of four participants. The study aims to contribute to ongoing discussions about L2 graduate student writing, specifically to expand on the currently limited research on learning and use of direct quotes in literature reviews.

Overview of Chapters

This study consists of six chapters. Chapter One presents the exigence of the study, situating the research on learning about direct quoting and use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations among other studies on source use in synthesizing, summarizing, and paraphrasing. Specifically, it describes some of the difficulties L2 graduate students face when they use direct quotes across academic genres, and it highlights the reasons to investigate how L2 graduate students learn to choose and use direct quotes in the literature reviews of theses and dissertations. Finally, it justifies the use of a social learning theory of LPP situated in a community of practice. Chapter Two defines the theoretical framework of LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the concepts of a community of practice, transparency, and legitimacy. It also describes how the key concepts of transparency and legitimacy are viewed by other scholars who have studied how L2 students understand and practice source use in literature reviews. Literature reviews are described in this chapter as posing particularly complex writing challenges for L2 graduate students. The complexity of literature reviews has also been researched through the occluded/hidden features seldom addressed by L2 graduate students' writing instructors or advisors. Chapter Three explains the study's research design, including the methods used, the selection of L2 graduate student participants who were in the US on

international visas, data collection, and data analysis and covers the rationale for using semi-structured interviews, text-based interviews, and textual analyses. It also describes the recruitment of participants and the methods for coding and analyzing interview transcripts and literature review drafts.

Chapters Four and Five report the results of this study by discussing the experiences of the participants and drawing connections between their responses and those of other participants in another empirical study on source use. Chapter Four focuses on findings gathered from semi-structured interviews, text-based interviews, and textual analyses of literature review drafts from the participants. The chapter then describes how the participating students learned about source use and direct quoting in formal and informal teaching settings in their home countries and at their U.S. universities. Additionally, it discusses how L2 graduate students use direct quotes in the literature reviews of theses and dissertations through the process of reading to write in direct quotes. Chapter Five focuses on findings from text-based interviews and textual analyses of participants' literature review drafts and discusses to what extent L2 graduate students' understanding of direct quote use in literature reviews helps them to establish themselves as members of their disciplines. Chapter Six reiterates major findings based on the original research questions, provides practical implications for those working with L2 graduate students such as including instructors and advisors, and ends with suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study investigated how L2 graduate students learn about direct quoting and the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations. Utilizing the theoretical framework of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP), the study aims to provide an understanding of how learning about direct quoting and the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations helps L2 graduate students to establish themselves as members of their disciplines. In the context of this study, use of direct quotes refers to incorporating sources by identifying, selecting, and placing them into ones' own texts to serve rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007). This chapter discusses the theoretical framework of LPP and its concepts of a community of practice, transparency, and legitimacy. These concepts situate learning about source use into the context of students' disciplines in a community of practice and its disciplinary practices. For students to learn about source use, particularly direct quoting in literature reviews they need transparent and legitimate access to learning. To obtain transparency for learning about source use in literature reviews, they also need to participate in various activities of their disciplines and learn from experienced members. This chapter also considers how LPP and its concepts of a community of practice, legitimacy, and transparency have been used in studies on learning about source use in literature reviews. In these studies, learning to use sources in literature reviews is described as a complex process in which students face various challenges and difficulties.

The Theoretical Framework of Legitimate Peripheral Participation

A social learning theory of LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991) was developed from Vygotsky's (1962) concept of the zone of proximal development in which a learner learns alone but also through collaboration and learning everyday activities from more experienced individuals. According to Lave and Wenger's (1991) comment on Vygotsky's notion of learning, "the social character of learning mostly consists in a small "aura" of socialness that provides input for the process of internalization viewed as individualistic acquisition of the cultural given" (p. 27). It is the aim of LPP to study learning beyond the contexts of pedagogical structuring, "including the structure of the social world in the analysis, and taking into account in a central way the conflictual nature of social practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 27). Only by participating in disciplinary communities a learner is able to learn, negotiate, and renegotiate the shared social practices of their community of practice.

LPP is viewed as a social theory of learning by which newcomers of a community of practice gradually move from a periphery toward fuller participation in a given community's activities by interacting with more experienced community members. Learning in this case refers to participation in social practice that is embedded in that community's authentic activities, context, and culture. Social interactions and collaborations between new members and old members are key components of situated learning in a community of practice. Lave and Wenger (1991) explained how new members of a community of practice are socialized through older and more experienced members into practice of a community through legitimate peripheral participation. In order to investigate this process, the crucial concept of community of practice is discussed below.

Community of Practice and Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Wenger (1998) defined community of practice as an open, dynamic body, “a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (p. 98). This definition applies to L2 graduate students’ past and present learning experiences about source use and direct quoting from a perspective of newcomers as novice writers and scholars learning from more experienced members in their own disciplines. A community of practice in the context of this study is viewed as a student’s discipline of social science.

The term ‘a community of practice’ was coined by Lave and Wenger (1991) while studying apprenticeship as a model for learning to become a professional. A community of practice is formed by people who are engaged in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavor (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). These groups of people share a concern or a passion for something they do and for learning how to do it better as they interact with one another on a regular basis (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Thus, becoming a fully recognized member of community of practice is not seen as an individual acquisition of social practice, but rather as a learning process that is described as participation in community’s social practice and its activities together with more experienced members. In other words, each member of a community gains strengths from the others in the same community (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998).

LPP situates learning through participating in social practice of a community of practice. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), social practice is “the relational interdependency of agent and world, activity, meaning, cognition, learning, and knowing. It emphasizes the inherently socially negotiated character of meaning and the interested, concerned character of the thought

and action of persons-in-activity” (p. 29). Furthermore, through social practice “learning, thinking, and knowing are relations among people in activity in, with, and arising from the socially and culturally structured world” (p. 29). Even though social practice of the social world referred to as communities of practice is formed under the influence of systems and structures, a participating member has the right to negotiate the meaning of social practice. In fact, change is inherent in a community of practice and its activities because “activity and the participation of individuals involved in it, their knowledge, and their perspectives are mutually constitutive” (Wenger, 1998, p. 117).

In the context of this study, the participants learned about direct quoting and use of direct quotes in literature reviews by engaging in social practice so they could contribute to existing research and establish themselves as members of their disciplines. Overall, social practice is everything that these L2 graduate students need to know to function in their disciplines. However, participating in established social practice is not without challenges, especially for newcomers. Practice can stay hidden or implicit to many learners. Wenger (1998) described practice as follows:

[The] concept of practice includes both the explicit and the tacit. It includes what is said and what is left unsaid; what is represented and what is assumed. It includes the language, tools, documents, images, symbols, well-defined roles, specified criteria, codified procedures, regulations, and contracts that various practices make explicit for a variety of purposes. But it also includes all the implicit relations, tacit conventions, subtle cues, untold rules of thumb, recognizable intuitions, specific perceptions, well-tuned sensitivities, embodied understandings, underlying assumptions, and shared world views. (p. 47)

From this explanation, it is evident learning is never just an isolated cognitive process but also a socially and contextually influenced process that occurs in a community of practice, such as a student's discipline (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Learning is always situated in social relations and social engagement through negotiated meaning. As Lave and Wenger's (1991) theory of LPP suggests, if newcomers want to imitate the practices of a discipline, they must gain proficiency and knowledge of practices that cannot always be transparently observed and imitated.

Although LPP seems to be an idealized learning model built on a harmonious relationship between an L2 graduate student—a newcomer—and a mentor/advisor—experienced member—described by a mutual engagement, participation, and observation, there are studies that have found that learning in a community of practice is not always successful due to many factors. For instance, students' learning may be hindered by a lack critical reading and writing skills for writing in academic genre or low language proficiencies for writing, reading, and speaking in an appropriate language of a community of practice such as an academic discipline (Dong, 1996, 1998). Successful learning in a community of practice does not always depend on students' language proficiency and ability to write and read critically in the academic genre; it can also depend on how welcoming a community of practice is to a newcomer. This particularly includes how willing a community of practice is to accept a newcomer from the periphery as a legitimate participant and how much transparent learning a community of practice is able to offer to a newcomer (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998).

Transparency and legitimacy are the key concepts of LPP that integrate a newcomer from the periphery into legitimate belonging and participating. Transparency and legitimacy are not always given automatically to newcomers by more experienced members. In fact, the conflictual relationship between the more experienced members and the newcomers can cause difficulties in

providing full legitimate and transparent access to on-going activities, tasks, and artifacts for newcomers. This makes learning as participation in the social practice of a discipline demanding for newcomers. In the context of this study, the problems of transparency and legitimacy arise as students attempt to learn about direct quoting through the invisible /occluded features of source use in literature reviews of theses and dissertations, through implicit teaching instruction of source use in literature reviews, and through an advisor/student relationship (Kwan, 2008; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019).

Transparency and Legitimacy

Obtaining legitimate and transparent access to social practice of a community of practice is a crucial step towards learning for a newcomer that should eventually lead to status as an experienced member. However, newcomers to a community of practice who participate from the periphery usually have fewer opportunities to make any changes or contribute to any transformation. Learning from the more experienced members in a community of practice is not always easy for newcomers; not all experienced members are willing to accept the newcomers as legitimate participants. As observed by Lave and Wenger (1991):

A major contradiction lies between legitimate peripheral participation as the means of achieving continuity over generations for the community of practice, and the displacement inherent in that same process as full participants are replaced (directly or indirectly) by newcomers-become-more experienced members.” (p. 66)

The relationship between a newcomer and more experienced community members is crucial in this process. Every learner takes various learning trajectories that often depend on legitimate access to activities and transparency of social relations and forms of activities, “coordination of participation and the legitimacy of partial, increasing, changing participation within a

community” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31). These aspects carry importance for a learning process as legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The learning process is, therefore, in a constant state of change.

In a way, the LPP learning process is founded on the desire to produce, reproduce, or change social practice of community, and the desire to form new learners’ identities can be a source of conflict between a more experienced member and a newcomer. Viewing learning as legitimate peripheral participation means that learning in a community of practice “is not merely a condition of membership but is itself an evolving form of membership. We conceive of identities as long-term, living relations between persons and their place and participation in communities of practice. Thus identity, knowing, and social membership entail one another” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 29). Learning in a community of practice refers not only to the development of “knowledgeably skilled identities in practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31) but also to the reproduction and transformation of a community of practice that depends on the degree of contribution from a newcomer and a negotiation between newcomers and more experienced members. However, Lave and Wenger (1991) indicated that “to become a full member of a community of practice requires access to a wide range of ongoing activity, more experienced members, and other members of the community; and to information, resources, and opportunities for participation” (p. 57). Information and resources are important parts of written discourse in academic disciplines and are represented as artifacts in Lave and Wenger’s (1991) theory of LPP. These artifacts, such as genre, concepts, and theories, carry a substantial portion of a practice’s heritage and they should be transparent to learners, as they are engaged in continuing practice. However, the transparency of artifacts also depends on ways a learner is able

to participate and on a learner's legitimate status in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Wenger (1998) has discussed the concept of legitimacy as a way:

to be on an inbound trajectory, newcomers must be granted enough legitimacy to be treated as potential members. Only with legitimacy can all their inevitable stumbling and violations become opportunities for learning rather than cause for dismissal, neglect, or exclusion. (p. 101)

Legitimacy is, therefore, essential for successful learning; however, legitimacy often depends on power relations and hierarchical social structures inside communities of practice. Power relations can prevent learning and hinder access to the array of resources that leads a newcomer to full legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). For these reasons, artifacts are not always visible to learners because the systems and structures that are part of community of practice and that help to create and transform artifacts of social practice may be unknown to them. Transparency and legitimacy require understanding the cultural practice and social organization of a community of practice that can be achieved only by those who are completely accepted into the practices of the community.

Gaining transparency and legitimacy can be difficult for newcomers and especially so for L2 graduate students because they may be mistakenly assumed to be experienced writers. According to Polio and Shi (2012), exposure to disciplinary knowledge of source use, such as what to cite, how to cite, when to cite, and where to cite, often remains unclear for many newcomers of disciplines. This circumstance leads to the next section of this chapter, which discusses studies that feature learning about source use in literature reviews from the perspective of L2 graduate students as newcomers and the challenges and difficulties they often face.

Learning to Use Sources in Literature Reviews

This section is divided into two parts. The first part reviews studies of learning about source use and writing from sources. These studies on L2 graduate writing do not emphasize learning direct quoting because direct quoting is often considered a simple intertextual skill. However, learning to use direct quotes in literature reviews requires L2 graduate students to acquire similar knowledge and skills used in other intertextual skills such as paraphrasing and summarizing (Beaufort, 2004; Casanave, 2008; Turner & Bitchener, 2008; Chen et al., 2015; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). The second part of this section examines studies that apply the theoretical framework of LPP and its concepts of communities of practice, transparency, and legitimacy. These studies have identified L2 graduate students as newcomers and emerging experts who learn about source use in literature reviews through participation not just in written but also in oral discourse of their disciplines (Casanave, 2008). When they learn about source use from experienced community members, they are able to move from knowledge telling, which includes copying and patchwriting, to knowledge transformation, especially when they can use sources to advance their own arguments (Howard, 1999; Abasi & Akbari, 2006; Costley, 2008; Petric, 2012; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). Some studies (Casanave, 2002; Kuwahara, 2008; Prior & Min, 2008; Douglas, 2020) have considered moving from knowledge telling to knowledge transformation as a transition from writing in undergraduate studies to writing in graduate studies. For example, the gap was revealed between undergraduate writing and graduate writing skill sets which has caused concerns for students and faculty (Douglas, 2020). Furthermore, the transition from undergraduate writing to graduate writing is often difficult for L2 graduate students because they can encounter non-transparent access and non-legitimate obstacles to

learning about source use in literature reviews when they enter their graduate studies (Pecorari, 2006; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019).

Writing from Sources and Source Use

L2 graduate students usually learn about source use and writing from sources in graduate coursework and L2 graduate writing classes before they start writing their theses and dissertations. In these classes, they generally write annotated bibliographies, research papers based on secondary sources, research proposals, and book reviews. Although these assignments require students to use sources through synthesizing, summarizing, or paraphrasing, these tasks do not always completely prepare students for writing literature reviews for theses and dissertations (Badenhorst, 2018, 2019; Casanave, 2002; Zhu & Cheng, 2008).

The scholarship on writing from sources has focused on how undergraduate students incorporate sources by identifying, selecting, and placing sources into students' writing context using the intertextual skills of summarizing, synthesizing, and paraphrasing in various academic genres (Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2010; Plakans & Gebril, 2012, 2013; Hirvela & Du, 2013). However, scholarship on writing from sources has been scarce among L2 graduate students because they are already expected to have mastered these skills (Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000). The fact that L2 graduate students are often mistakenly considered already proficient writers (Belcher, 1994; Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000) leaves studies on L2 graduate writing, especially writing from sources, under researched.

L2 graduate writing scholarship on source use (Cumming et al., 2016; McCulloch, 2013; Yang & Shi, 2003) has focused mostly on the linguistic features and rhetorical functions of incorporated summaries and paraphrases in various academic genres across many disciplines (Hyland, 1999; Thompson, 2001; Samraj, 2013). The studies that have researched linguistic

features of summaries and paraphrases attended to the use of reporting verbs and to the way sources were incorporated as integral and non-integral citations. The use of integral or non-integral citations was dependent on the genre and the discipline (Hyland, 1999).

The scholarship on source use, particularly research into the way in which the rhetorical functions of sources are used in academic genres (Thompson & Tribble, 2001; Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013), has mostly been conducted among L2 graduate students. The various rhetorical functions of source use (Appendix E) have often indicated graduate writing advancement and graduate students' transfer from learners in a periphery of a discipline to emerging experts in the center of their disciplines. The variety of rhetorical functions served by source use seems to be greater among more advanced students who also show more extensive use of sources in purposes beyond attribution, such as evaluation, exemplification, application, and establishing links between sources, whereas less experienced writers rely solely on the rhetorical function of attribution. The use of rhetorical functions such as attribution, exemplification, or application of paraphrases and summaries in academic genres also reflects how familiar more accomplished L2 graduate writers are with source use in their disciplines (Dong, 1998; Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013).

Because scholarship on L2 graduate writing from sources and source use has concentrated on the linguistic features of summaries and paraphrases and rhetorical functions of source use through textual analyses and text-based interviews, some questions have remained unanswered: How do L2 graduate students as newcomers (Lave & Wenger, 1991) learn to use sources in direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations in their disciplines?; How do they as newcomers use sources and in what rhetorical functions in literature reviews, and in what activities and tasks do they participate in when they learn to use sources in direct quotes in

literature reviews? Petric (2012) attributed the lack of research interest in direct quoting to the fact that direct quoting “does not require any textual modification of a borrowed material” (p. 102). The use of direct quoting has mostly been investigated only for its overuse in a text and for inappropriate textual borrowing in scholarship on plagiarism.

Research on plagiarism has demonstrated that inappropriate textual borrowing among L2 undergraduate and graduate students is caused by the inconsistent presentation of source use norms across disciplines and among students and faculty (Prior, 1998; Shi, 2004, 2006, 2011, 2012). Hyland (1999) pointed out that these differences are influenced by “the epistemological and social conventions of their disciplines” (p.341). However, a variety of studies on writing from sources and plagiarism also attribute overuse of direct quotes and inappropriate textual borrowing to L2 graduate students’ lack of language proficiency, lack of reading and writing skills, and diversity of linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds (Canagarajah, 2002; Keck, 2006; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Polio & Shi, 2012; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Cumming et al., 2016).

As L2 graduate students start writing literature reviews for their theses and dissertations, they are assumed to already know about source use in the academic genre. Studies (e.g., Pecorari, 2006; Kwan, 2008) have shown that this false perception is often accepted by L2 graduate students’ advisors. Consequently, these students seldom receive enough feedback on source use and literature review writing. Additionally, checking the accuracy of paraphrases, summaries, or direct quotes in literature reviews is difficult for advisors (Pecorari, 2006).

Research on writing literature reviews has highlighted the problems and pointed out the various intricacies and challenges L2 graduate students encounter while writing literature reviews. Literature reviews in theses and dissertations are complex because they require more

than just knowledge of source use in terms of critical reading and critical writing (Kwan, 2008). According to Badenhorst's (2018, 2019) research of literature review writing among graduate students, the aim of a literature review is to address the gap in existing research and fill the gap with a new claim and new knowledge. When students write literature reviews of theses and dissertations, they must combine reading, writing, and researching skills (Kwan, 2008). Becoming adjusted to this process takes a long time for L2 graduate students, and directed guidance is important in this process (Kwan, 2008).

Recent studies by Chen et al. (2015) and Badenhorst (2018) have addressed the obstacles graduate students encounter while writing a literature review, including linguistic, methodological, conceptual, and ontological challenges. Linguistic challenges are identified as problems of genre requirements, rhetorical moves/steps, vocabulary, sentence, or citation patterns. Methodological challenges arise when selecting relevant sources and synthesizing them in a coherent argument (Chen et al., 2015; Badenhorst, 2018). Conceptual challenges are identified as difficulties in understanding of literature review purposes such as “identifying the gaps in the literature, providing a rationale for the study” (Badenhorst, 2018, p. 122) situating a study among other studies. Ontological challenges develop “when writing a literature review involves identity-work by engaging in the epistemologies of the discipline through the writing process itself” (Badenhorst, 2018, p. 123).

The reason that L2 graduate students struggle with conceptual understanding of writing literature reviews is that the understanding of literature reviews varies depending on whether they are intended to serve research articles, dissertations, theses, or research papers. They do not “represent [a] single and monolithic genre – literature reviews serve different purposes in different contexts and require different approaches for the different purposes served” (Zhu &

Cheng, 2008, p. 144). A general perception among L2 graduate students is that writing literature reviews is primarily monolithic and mostly about summarizing secondary sources. Kwan's (2008) study shows that some L2 graduate students understand writing the literature reviews of theses and dissertations to be analogous to writing secondary sources research papers.

To help graduate students understand literature reviews in theses and dissertations, Bruce (2014) pointed out that the path to understanding the role and practice of literature reviews in theses and dissertations should be addressed by developing and challenging students as they explore, analyze, and discuss collected data and secondary sources. The literature reviews of theses and dissertations should not just display knowledge or become knowledge telling and summaries of sources in the way often taught in undergraduate writing but should move to knowledge transformation (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987; Zhu & Cheng, 2008). Knowledge transformation in literature review writing is described as a process when a writer elaborates on an argument found in a source and advances the argument by aligning it with research questions, data collection, data analysis, and theoretical framework (Zhu & Cheng, 2008).

In order to overcome the difficulties associated with writing literature reviews, L2 graduate students should learn to use sources in literature reviews by carefully choosing and critically evaluating selected texts, synthesizing existing research, and constructing a coherent, consistent, and valid argument incorporating their own ideas in order to contribute to the existing scholarship of a discipline with some measure of originality (Turner & Bitchener, 2008; Bruce, 2014; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). The work of Chen et al. (2015) and Badenhorst (2018) found that writing successful literature reviews mirrors the level of skills and knowledge that graduate students acquire by learning and participating in practices of their disciplines. Beaufort's (2004) concept that the five types of knowledge students need to possess to successfully learn and

participate in the disciplines—genre, discourse-community, subject-matter, rhetorical, and writing-process—may be especially important to the focus of the current study in considering how L2 graduate students learn to use source material in direct quotes in literature reviews. Badenhorst (2018) also considered these domains of knowledge to be especially important for writing literature reviews and defined them in the context of research:

Discourse-community knowledge refers to an understanding of the disciplinary language and values inherent in academic writing. Subject-matter knowledge is the substantive contribution of writing, this is knowledge of a content area. Genre knowledge relates to the common formats/agreements between readers and writers-in a discipline. Rhetorical knowledge is the ability to analyze and respond to audiences, texts and purposes for writing. Writing process knowledge refers to an understanding of the developmental processes that are involved in writing. In other words, one understands that revising drafts of writing will produce a better-quality final product. (p. 59-60)

Simpson et al (2016) also identified the knowledge needed to become a disciplinary insider: subject matter knowledge, genre knowledge, writing process knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, information literacy, and disciplinary discourse knowledge. L2 graduate students in particular must acquire information literacy and disciplinary discourse knowledge in order to correctly and ethically incorporate and use sources in the academic genres of their disciplines. Information literacy, as defined by Simpson et al (2016)), is the ability to find relevant sources and critically evaluate them based on the values of the discipline. Disciplinary discourse knowledge refers to understanding how to appropriately use the language of the discipline, how to paraphrase and summarize information, and recognizing which terms need to be cited and which terms have synonyms (Simpson et al., 2016).

Studies researching literature reviews have also confirmed that writing literature reviews requires students to possess higher order thinking skills such as the ability to connect multiple sources and review knowledge in sophisticated ways (Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). All of these elements constitute the complexity of literature reviews and many graduate students struggle to overcome this complexity (Turner & Bitchener, 2008; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019).

LPP and a Community of Practice in L2 Graduate Writing Studies

The results of studies that utilized LPP and its concepts of a community of practice have shown that to overcome the complexity and challenges of writing literature reviews and source use in them, L2 graduate students cannot learn the textual conventions of source use, such as standards about plagiarism and the rhetorical moves and steps of literature reviews, by only managing the intervention of a text. They also need to be engaged in participatory practices that “[are] surround[ed] and are embedded in textual practices” (Casanave, 2008, p. 17). Participatory practices include participating in a scholarly conversation described as “the activity of participating in the oral and written textual practices of specialized communities...classes, seminars, meetings with advisors, and consultations with classmates and colleagues” (Casanave, 2008, p. 19). Learning to participate in these scholarly activities requires L2 graduate students to read and write critically as emerging experts in their disciplines. For example, they are asked to “respond thoughtfully and critically rather than just absorb information from so-called experts” (Casanave, 2008, p. 19) and situate their writing in their established communities. Therefore, source use in literature reviews is not only about learning to become proficient in the English language and have knowledge of reading and writing but also about learning how to fully participate in scholarly disciplines as newcomers. To fully participate, newcomers can form

relationships with experienced members, socially interact with them, and collaborate with them through research projects as co-researchers and co-authors (Casanave, 2008).

Students who learn this process and who want to move from the periphery to the center of their discipline must develop their use of sources from knowledge telling to knowledge transforming (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987; Costley, 2008, Kuwahara, 2008; Li, 2008; Douglas, 2020). Many studies have described the transition from knowledge telling to knowledge transformation as a transfer from undergraduate writing to graduate writing (Costley, 2008; Kuwahara, 2008; Li, 2008; Zhu & Cheng, 2008; Douglas, 2020). These studies have also considered this transition to be a transfer from a learner of knowledge to a producer of new knowledge. For example, Douglas (2020) described this shift in her study:

Through their writing, graduate students are shifting their identity from learner to producer of research in order to make new knowledge claims in their field and to join the research community for that discipline. Making new knowledge claims involves an identity change in academic status as well as an epistemological change in relation to the field; graduate students must learn how to critique previous knowledge claims, articulate a gap or niche in the field, and argue that their research addresses this area by contributing new knowledge. (p. 71-72)

Studies have also revealed that the majority of students are unprepared to transfer to their graduate programs because they are lacking the advanced critical reading and writing skills necessary for writing in graduate coursework and later for writing theses and dissertations (Dong, 1996, 1998; Douglas, 2020). L2 graduate students who have not taken any composition classes in their first language or in English find it difficult to adopt the skill sets required for competent graduate writing (Casanave, 2002; Douglas, 2020). In addition, their undergraduate

writing assignments in other courses may not have prepared them with the same skill sets needed for graduate writing. Beyond these challenges, they have to overcome cultural differences in writing style; for example, graduate writing at U.S. universities is more argumentative than descriptive. In writing arguments, graduate students have to state and support a main point (Douglas, 2020); however, many L2 graduate students who enter U.S. graduate programs are used to writing in an inductive argumentative style that leaves the main point for conclusion. Furthermore, some L2 graduate students have never been taught any forms of argumentative writing in their undergraduate studies in their home countries (Douglas, 2020).

In addition to mastering the argumentative framework, L2 graduate students encounter new linguistic, rhetorical, and disciplinary conventions (Douglas, 2020). Abasi and Graves (2008) maintained that L2 graduate students need “extra development” to use writing conventions and argumentative framework for making new knowledge, critiquing previous sources, and establishing their own research identities (Douglas, 2020, p. 73). In fact, studies of L2 graduate writing have shown that even when they start writing their theses and dissertations some L2 graduate students are still struggling to make the transition from knowledge telling to knowledge transformation (Dong, 1996, 1998; Casanave, 2008; Costley, 2008; Fujioka, 2008; Li, 2008; Zhu & Cheng, 2008).

To be able to transform knowledge, L2 graduate students often tend to rely on knowledge telling by “copying directly from source texts, including too many citations and representing texts with numerous and lengthy direct quotations...[presenting content] as discrete bits of unproblematic information because source documents are viewed by novice writers as containers of truthful information” (Badenhorst, 2018, p. 60). Students who write and use

sources as knowledge telling are unable to critique sources and integrate and expand on the content with their own ideas. They see sources only as truth and facts (Bruce, 2014).

In addition to copying, students also have a tendency to patchwrite—the overuse of long quotes or quotation fragments—which is also a common solution for most novice L2 graduate writers. A quotation fragment is either a part of a sentence or a string of words that is integrated in a student's own text (Petric, 2012); using quotation fragments is a sign of patchwriting (Howard, 1999) but also a sign of learning and moving “toward membership in a discourse community, a means of learning unfamiliar language and ideas” (Petric, 2012, p. 111). Quotation fragments such as short strings often reveal an L2 writer’s uncertainty:

[They can be] a reflection of the student's beliefs about appropriate citing conventions and insecurity about the status of such borrowing...L2 writers may be inclined to treat combinations of words they have not encountered before as unique formulations specific to the source that need to be quoted directly rather than paraphrased (Petric, 2012, p. 110).

Britton et al. (1975) examined the developmental nature of source use and listed several stages students must go through to master these skills. Students usually begin with mechanical copying of sources, imitating writing style, tones, rhetorical moves, and borrowing words. Howard (1999) argued that, in fact, patchwriting is a natural stage of learning for which students should not be always penalized for plagiarizing.

The vast research on inappropriate textual borrowing and plagiarism (Shi, 2004, 2006, 2011, 2012) eventually led to the reconsideration of inappropriate source use and overuse of direct quotes as a learning stage of source use (Howard, 1999). Patchwriting and overuse of direct quotes are part of learning process of source use in which newcomers in particular engage.

Many studies in L2 undergraduate writing consider patchwriting and overuse of direct quotes as a survival learning strategy for many novice writers and as a means by which students can become familiar with disciplinary source use (Howard, 1999; Keck, 2006; Davis, 2013). According to Petric's (2012) study that investigated how L2 graduate students use direct quotes in their theses, students who use quotes in their writing have to know how to incorporate a text contextually and co-textually. It is at this point that they encounter problems and turn to patchwriting and overuse of direct quotes to solve those problems. Petric (2012) wrote that students face a situation wherein they have to work with very different stylistic, grammatical, and contextually situated quotes that they try to reconcile with their own voice. Furthermore, this is something what students are rarely taught by the more experienced members in their disciplines. Petric's (2012) study also pointed out that in order to successfully use direct quotes, students must understand the meaning of a quote, and thus must have good reading comprehension skills. To demonstrate understanding a quotation's meaning, students must comment on it and introduce it appropriately into the correct context of an academic genre.

It is also important to mention that for many L2 graduate students the learning stages such as patchwriting and overuse of direct quotes are ways in which they can show other members of a discipline that they are familiar with their disciplinary scholarship (Howards, 1999; Keck, 2006; Davis, 2013). Abasi, Akbari, and Graves (2006) also showed how students cited references to establish themselves as more experienced participants of their disciplines. For example, in Badenhorst's (2019) study, student participants Paul and Shirley performed patchwriting and overuse of direct quotes as a way to gain legitimacy while engaging with the often confusing source use practices of their discipline. Badenhorst (2019) observed that Shirley and Paul use sources to 'perform' variety of scholarly identities through patchwriting. Other

studies (Petric, 2007, 2012; Harwood & Petric, 2013) indicated that students cite and overuse sources, not for showing that they have knowledge about a topic but because they want to receive a good grade.

However, with time and practice, students cross over to knowledge transforming where sources are used as “as connectors to link ideas, concepts, arguments and perspectives” (Badenhorst, 2018, p. 60). By moving toward knowledge transformation, they begin to align themselves with allegiance, positioning, and authority, and form particular academic identities for themselves. This makes them more legitimate and experienced members in a community of practice.

More studies have underscored the finding that the difficulties graduate students face are not just the results of their linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds but also of occluded features of academic writing and non-transparent and non-legitimate access to learning about source use (Pecorari, 2006; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). Occluded features make learning to write literature reviews that exhibit appropriate source use more difficult, especially for L2 graduate learners as newcomers of disciplines (Pecorari, 2006). Therefore, L2 graduate students need more transparent and legitimate access to learning about source use in literature reviews of theses and dissertations and which should be acquired by working closely with their advisors (Kwan, 2008; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019).

Occluded Features of Literature Review Writing

The term ‘occluded’ was used by Swales (1996) in connection with genre writing such as job applications or letters accompanying an article submission that are “typically hidden, out of sight or occluded from the public gaze” (Pecorari, 2006, p. 6). In this section, writing literature reviews and learning to use sources in them are assumed to be occluded to students.

A literature review as genre “encapsulates academic social practice, performance and identity” (Badenhorst, 2019, p. 265) and the invisible nature of academic customs. The invisible nature of academic writing underlies the results of studies revealing that L2 graduate students find it difficult to learn literature reviews practices such as the ability to link and evaluate sources, extend them with students’ own ideas, and select relevant direct quotes. Badenhorst (2019) attributed inability of graduate students to correctly use sources in academic genres such as literature reviews to “[t]he tacit nature of academic writing and, in many cases, lack of writing pedagogy often keep opportunities for graduate students to gain necessary knowledge and practice in using citations to a minimum” (p. 264). L2 graduate students are usually introduced to writing literature reviews through the Create a Research Space (CARS) model (Swales, 1990) with its rhetorical moves and steps for source use through plagiarism (Badenhorst, 2019). However, appropriate source use in literature reviews requires students to acquire the more complex practices, knowledge, and skills of a discipline than beyond adhering plagiarism norms. Supervisors and committee members are often unaware that these practices are obscure and hidden to students (Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). Therefore, “it is essential to make these practices more visible to students if they are to successfully navigate this genre” (Badenhorst, 2018, p. 59).

The rest of this section introduces the research that elaborates on this task. The overview explains how teaching students about the concepts of intertextuality and critical engagement (Badenhorst, 2019) makes learning about source use in literature reviews less hidden to them. Last, the following also underscores the importance of a good relationship between student and advisor—the newcomer and the experienced community member—that can also make this learning more explicit.

The concept of intertextuality sees any text as any compilation of other texts where “[a] meaning is constructed *in situ* between the self, others and the context which suggests that all texts are situated and embedded in social practices” (Badenhorst, 2019, p. 265). In other words, other texts mediate the construction of meaning in a new text. According to Badenhorst (2019), “in writing a literature review, intertextuality is embedded in the discipline that rests on argument and where a new claim or new argument is constructed only in relation to what is required” (p. 265). Intertextuality is sometimes explicit when sources are cited, but sometimes intertextual references are implicit and can be understood only by experienced members. The more students remain and learn in their disciplines, the more they become experienced legitimate writers and readers of dense academic texts (Badenhorst, 2019).

In Badenhorst’s (2019) study Paul, a student with high intertextual flexibility, showed conceptual understanding of literature review as a genre that addresses and fills the gap in the existing research. Paul’s writing showed a high degree of intertextual flexibility; he evaluated sources critically and was able to expand on sources while bringing in his own point of view. Paul was also able to draw on more integral citations as signs of his own authority; he summarized and synthesized sources and did not misinterpret the information. On the other hand, Shirley showed signs of low intertextual flexibility. Her writing was informative rather than argumentative; she relied extensively on quotes, including long block quotes. Clearly Shirley did not understand the concept of literature review, and her writing was more like a list of sources that were not connected or evaluated.

Shirley’s case shows the importance of teaching students about sources through critical engagement. Criticality or critical engagement is a cornerstone of literature review writing and requires a student to assess the values of claims, theories, research designs, and methods

(Bitchener, 2010). Bedenhorst (2019) described critical engagement as a focus on “the relevance, meaning and contribution of the source. What is the overall message of the source text? How does that source text contribute to an argument? What value does that source text contain? How can it be used to draw on authority, or persuade a reader?” (p. 273).

In addition to being taught critical engagement and intertextuality, newcomers should learn about sources in literature reviews from the experienced hands of the community. When L2 graduate students embark on writing literature reviews as newcomers, they eventually become more experienced members of their communities of practice by learning from more experienced members and by participating in the authentic tasks, activities, and practices of their disciplines. Pecorari (2006) noticed that advisors as more experienced members seldom provided feedback on students’ citations because they were usually unaware of how to construct valuable feedback that would address students’ mistakes about citations. When students use sources in writing their theses and dissertations, it can be difficult for advisors to track how accurately these sources have been incorporated in students’ texts. Many students misinterpret information or instead of original text use a secondary text that they claim to be the original. Other studies (Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002; Shi, 2011, 2012) have confirmed that questions of “what to cite, how to cite, why to cite, where to cite, how often to cite, who to cite, and even when not to cite” (Polio & Shi, 2012, p. 95) remain implicit for many L2 graduate students.

Kwan’s (2009) study, one of a few that have emphasized the crucial role of relationships between newcomers and more experienced members in the process of selecting relevant sources for dissertations, showed that guidance from the experts is very important (Kwan, 2009). The study looked particularly at the ways L2 graduate students select relevant sources for forming their understanding of theoretical and conceptual frameworks in the research of their

dissertations. The results demonstrated that students rely extensively on the help of more experienced members of their discipline such as supervisors, more experienced peers, and experts outside their departments. Students participating in this study received various degrees of guidance in the form of oral and written feedback. As all participants were legitimate peripheral participants, they were all participating in the activities of their disciplines and seeking more understanding about the topics of their dissertations through searching, selecting, and reading relevant sources. It was also confirmed that relevant sources served as a model for them in terms of vocabulary and the structure of theses.

Kwan's (2009) study showed how guidance from more experienced members is crucial for newcomers in the initial and middle stages of writing dissertations. Kwan (2009) stated that "[the] guidance is important not only in facilitating their reference research but also in socializing them into the research communities into which they are seeking entry" (p. 189). Successful guidance can also help students identify the means of participation that may build their social network. The more students become experienced participants, the more knowledge about the scholarship evolves. Furthermore, since Kwan's (2009) participants came from disciplines in which paradigmatic devices were not stable, selecting relevant sources for their dissertations became a challenging task.

Paradigmatic devices constitute "objects of studies, theoretical orientation, and methodological approaches" (Kwan, 2009, p. 181). "A field or discipline is also defined by various social devices which encompass inter alia, professional societies, the journals read by its members, conferences and seminars they attend, the formal and informal networks of communication, idols, and heroes." (Kwan, 2009, p. 181). If students become familiar with these paradigmatic devices and social devices of their disciplines, they are usually able to learn how

sources are used in the academic genre. Therefore, advisors should be able to pinpoint not only the relevant sources in databases but also the important concepts and theories that help them form a better understanding of their dissertation topics.

By drawing on these studies, the current study has sought to extend conversations on learning about the use of sources in literature reviews of theses and dissertations by applying LPP theory, which accounts for learning from the periphery to the center in students' disciplines and can be described as newcomers learning from experienced members. The concepts of the legitimacy and transparency of LPP are essential for learning about source use in literature reviews of theses and dissertations. To generate an understanding of how L2 graduate students learn about direct quoting and the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of their own disciplines, this study employed semi-structured interviews responses, text-based interviews responses, and textual analyses in the context of the disciplines of sociology and history at a large U.S. university.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This study aims to generate a better understanding about how learning about direct quoting and the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations can help L2 graduate students establish themselves as members of their disciplines. The study addresses three research questions:

1. How do L2 graduate students learn to use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations?

2. How do L2 graduate students use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations?

3. To what extent does an understanding of use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations help L2 graduate students to establish themselves as members of their disciplines?

To answer these questions, this study examined how L2 graduate students as novice writers/scholars learn about direct quoting and use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations. Additionally, it aims to describe to what extent their understanding of the use of direct quotes in literature reviews helps them to establish themselves as members of their disciplines. This study undertook a qualitative case study of four international graduate students of various cultural, educational, and linguistic backgrounds in a discipline of social science during the spring of 2019, summer of 2019, and fall of 2019 at a large public university located in the southeastern region of the United States. The data was collected from semi-structured interviews, text-based interviews, and textual analyses of students' literature review drafts. The participants also provided drafts of literature reviews a few days before a text-based interview:

two of them provided final drafts and two provided rough drafts. Since one doctoral student and one master's degree student were in the late stage of writing their theses and dissertations and were almost ready to defend, their drafts of literature review were, in fact, final versions. The other two rough drafts came from two doctoral student participants who were in the early stages of writing their dissertations.

The study followed a qualitative research approach for several reasons. The qualitative research is an "inquiry that helps us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena" (Merriam, 1998, p. 5). According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000), "a qualitative research is [a] situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. Qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world" (p. 3). It is, therefore, important to mention the role of a researcher in the study so that the reader knows what type of impact researcher's role will have on the final results.

Additionally, Dornyei (2007) recommended qualitative research for its flexibility and adaptability to the changes caused by its own situatedness in natural settings; it is the situatedness of research in natural settings that makes this form of research different from others. Dornyei (2007) also emphasized the role of researchers and interviewees who are themselves situated in natural settings. The researcher who is unfamiliar with the culture of an interviewee can still bring new points of view; in fact, any researcher in qualitative research can hardly be neutral. Researchers always bring their own cultural values and beliefs, and these may not always correspond with the beliefs and values of participants or the institution that sponsors the research. It is also necessary for a researcher to alleviate vagueness in interpretation by adding triangulation techniques. Such techniques can be implemented by including participants' writing

and context analysis, follow-up interviews, or retrospective protocols. It is important to keep in mind that qualitative research results are never neutral but instead are always open to more discussions, interpretations, and the scrutiny of future studies.

Rolls and Relf (2006) noted that “bracketing interviews enabled the researcher to hold the tension of the dialectic process of investigating the nature of the participants' experience, at the same time as holding her own experience” (p. 286). In the current study, bracketing interviews became a supportive research tool through which the research became more objective and more reflective, uncovering some assumptions and experiences that benefited the research during the process of collecting data. As an international graduate student myself, I brought my own cultural beliefs, assumptions, and experience into the current research that might have resonated with the participants. Using bracketing interviews as recommended by Rolls and Relf (2006) helped to eradicate those assumptions, experiences, and fears that could have caused any prejudice towards the research topic and had a negative impact on shaping the process of collecting the data. Bracketing interviews were conducted through dialogue with a colleague who was a doctoral student specializing in second language writing and who thus contributed her previous knowledge of working with multilingual students and methodological knowledge of analysis of students' texts to this study.

Qualitative research methods support inductive reasoning as an aid to understanding the relevance of relationships between the data and the context. Qualitative researchers study their subjects in natural settings in order to “make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln 1994, p. 2) In this study, students' experiences about source use learning were revealed using semi-structured interviews as a means of data collection to understand “the world from the subjects' point of view, to unfold meaning

from their experiences” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 1). This type of interview allows participants to “elaborate on the issues raised in an exploratory manner” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 136). It is important to note that text-based interviews and textual analyses were used to interpret, triangulate, broaden, and understand student participant interview data.

Additionally, the current qualitative research is a case study that portrays a more detailed picture of a certain phenomenon in natural settings and employs “an inductive form of analysis with the aim of building theory... from detailed study of particular instances” (Polio & Friedman, p. 76). During case study research, data is collected from various sources such as interviews, diaries, research logs, textual analysis, observations, and so on. Case study research, therefore, brings a very thick description of a phenomenon from participants’ various perspectives and, because a case study usually consists of a small number of participants, a close and more detailed investigation can reveal individual differences that might be lost in large scale analyses. According to Polio and Friedman (2016), “Case studies also allow for an in-depth study of processes that unfold over time, such as the experiences of individuals as they acquire L2 academic literacy” (p. 76). In addition, a case study is an excellent approach that helps to investigate the social view of writing rather than cognitive view (Polio & Friedman, 2016). Specifically, the case study used in the current research can address a student's individual past and present learning experiences with source use in literature reviews in more detail.

Using the theoretical framework of LPP, this study examined how L2 graduate students as newcomers learn about direct quotes and how they use them in literature reviews of theses and dissertations to establish themselves as members of their disciplines. Semi-structured interviews allowed exploration of how the participants—as newcomers from a periphery of a discipline—found that their past and present experiences of learning about sources use impacted their

knowledge of source use, particularly in the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations. Furthermore, this study investigated to what degree the students had legitimate and transparent access to learning about sources in their own disciplines and, through text-based interviews and textual analyses of their drafts, examined how students used direct quotes to establish themselves as members in their disciplines, and how they claimed authority in their academic departments and disciplines (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998).

Research Setting and Context

This study was conducted at a large public, four-year institution in the southeastern region of the United States. The research population was international graduate students. At this university, in 2019 international students made up over 13% of the student population enrolled in graduate and professional studies, of which 800 students were international graduate students (OIRA, 2019). The countries most represented by international graduate students at that time were China and India (OIRA, 2019). International graduate students at this institution have the option to take English 122 (Academic English for Graduate Students) offered by the English department; the course focuses on reading, writing, and speaking instructions for international graduate students and on academic writing in the disciplines. Graduate students are encouraged to register for English 122, especially when their TOEFL score results are less than 100 or IELTS less than 7.5. However, any L2 graduate student who wants to improve their academic writing and reading skills and is in the first three years of graduate study can attend this class as well. In addition to the opportunity to take English 122, some L2 graduate students have options for participating in departmental writing workshops.

Research Population and Participation Selection

Invitations to solicit participants for the study were emailed to Directors of Graduate Studies at the College of Education, Health, Human Sciences, and at the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville at the beginning of spring semester 2019 asking the recipients to pass along the invitation to all their international graduate students. The invitation email included information about the dissertation study and described the three introductory meetings international graduate students were invited to attend. Eight students responded to the invitation email, and three introductory meetings at various times and days accommodated their busy schedules. The three separate introductory meetings were held in reserved rooms at the university library during which students were introduced to the purpose of the study, how much time the interviews would take, what the students could expect if they agreed to participate and, finally, the risks and benefits of participating in the study. I also told the students more about my own educational background to establish a rapport with the participants so that “the resulting discourse would be a conversation, not an interview” (Seidman, 1998, p. 80).

I also explained the informed consent form and demographic sheet (Appendix B) that asked them to provide their previous academic writing experiences and educational and language backgrounds. Because the recruitment for the study was based on purposeful sampling using a strategy of criterion sampling (Dörnyei, 2007), the information from the demographic sheet helped to identify participants that met the recruiting criteria. These criteria were that they had to be in the process of writing their thesis or/and dissertation, they had to write at least one draft of a literature review, and they had to use direct quotes in literature reviews. A follow-up email invited four students who met the criteria to participate in the study: three doctoral students and

one master's degree student, all in social science. Their majors of study have not been identified in order to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants.

L2 graduate students were appropriate for this study because they have usually been under pressure to perform as fully developed novice researchers with their own voice of writing (Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000). Belcher (1994) warned against this categorization and emphasized the importance of helping international graduate students with the process of writing and adapting into new discipline discourse communities. It is also important to point out that most international graduate students are not only novice scholars but also novices in a culturally structured academe environment that is usually very different from what they were used to in their own countries (Flowerdew, 2000).

Some of the participants chose their pseudonyms, and those who declined to do so were assigned pseudonyms. The details of the participants are noted below, including pseudonyms, ages, and time of study in the United States:

- Sara was 29 years old in her third year of PhD study. Originally from East Asia, she received her M.A. degree in social science in her home country. This was her first time studying at a U.S. university. She had never taken any graduate writing classes and relied extensively on the Writing Center at her current institution for writing help.
- Joice was a 28-year-old PhD student from Southeast Asia. He was in his third year of PhD study and came to the United States to pursue his master's and doctoral degrees. Joice took L2 graduate writing classes while completing his master's degree and during the first year of his PhD study at his current institution.
- Liz was 35 years old and in her fourth year of PhD study. She was originally from South Asia having received her M.A. degree in social science first in her country and later from

a U.S. university. She took one L2 graduate writing class during her master's degree study at a U.S. university.

- Ernest was 26 years old and a second year M.A. student from Southeast Asia. He received his B.A. degree in social science from a U.S. university where he also took first-year composition courses specifically designed for L2 students.

Data Collection

This study involved one semi-structured interview and one text-based interview with each participant based on a textual analysis of their literature review draft. According to Polio and Friedman (2017), collected data from the interviews of case studies contributes to the etic perspective of a researcher (outsider) and to the emic perspective (insider). Moreover, they bring the authentic voices and individual characteristics of the insiders to deepen understanding of many areas in L1 and L2 writing that quantitative data cannot provide. For instance, interviews in the current study elicited perspectives on direct quoting in the academic genre of literature review across the disciplines of sociology and history. Additionally, the interviews yielded data not only about how students' use direct quotes into literature reviews of their theses and dissertations but also about how L2 graduate writers learn about source use in their own disciplines and how L2 graduate writers participate as novice members in their disciplines. A detailed explanation of the rationale for these data collection methods and how they were conducted follows below.

Demographic Sheets

The students received demographic sheets (Appendix B) during the initial information sessions. The goal of the sheets was to obtain demographic information about the participants, to

find whether the students used direct quotes, to learn about their L1 and L2 academic writing experiences, and to identify participants that fit the criteria for the study.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews. I conducted one semi-structured interview during the spring and summer of 2019 with each participant. Having a private space and ample time helped the students feel comfortable so they could elaborate on their answers to the interview questions. Semi-structured interviews are known for looser interview formats (Polio & Friedman, 2017). According to Dörnyei (2007), these interviews are pre-planned and have pre-prepared guiding questions and prompts while still encouraging the interviewee to “elaborate on the issues raised in an exploratory manner” (p. 136). Deviation from the questions is allowed, depending on how the dialogue between the interviewee and the interviewer is developing and whether the interview is proceeding correctly. However, the interviewer always tries to stay on the main topics. The flexibility of semi-structured interviews helps to create a friendly atmosphere for both the interviewer and interviewee and, moreover, makes the interviewee feel recognized (Polio & Friedman, 2017).

The semi-structured interviews helped provide insight about the students’ prior and current learning experiences with academic writing, source use, writing literature reviews, and use of direct quotes in L1 and L2 in their home countries and U.S. universities. Specifically, the questions of semi-structured interviews revealed the kinds disciplinary activities and tasks with which the L2 graduate students were involved and what struggles they had encountered in this learning process. During these semi-structured interviews, I followed the protocol for semi-structured interviews (Appendix C). If participants’ answers were not sufficient or provided minimal responses, I asked probing questions. I used the approach of active interviewing in

which the interviewer tries to incite the production of meaning through practices such as asking interviewees to try on different roles or to consider issues from different perspectives (Polio & Friedman, 2017). For example, I considered aspects of students' social positioning in their disciplines at U.S. universities first as international novice scholars of their disciplines, second as international graduate students of their departments, and third as future professionals in their disciplines.

Text-based interviews. I conducted one text-based interview with each participant after they finished their rough or final draft of their literature reviews towards the end of fall 2019. These interviews allowed me to analyze students' use of direct quotes with attention to the students' answers about rhetorical functions of direct quotes (Petric, 2007) and in what rhetorical moves and strategies these quotes were placed (Kwan, 2006). The text-based interviews allowed participants to reflect on their overall experiences writing literature reviews and the use of direct quotes. The ways in which text-based interviews are conducted depend on the text and features selected by the researcher (Polio & Friedman, 2017). In this case, I pointed to the features of direct quotes in literature review sections, particularly to brief quotations and extended quotations (Borg, 2000), and asked questions about why to quote, why to use a quote in a particular place, why to use a particular quote (Polio & Shi, 2012) (Appendix D). The participants chose the literature review sections on which to focus.

Since the structure of literature reviews in the fields of history and sociology often depends on the negotiation between a student and an advisor and is often identified as being embedded in theme-based chapters, the participants selected one chapter with an embedded literature review. Most literature reviews are embedded in theme-based and introduction chapters. Three participants (two doctoral students and one master's degree student) selected one

chapter about their theoretical framework with an embedded literature review, and one doctoral student sent me a literature review embedded in the introduction chapter. Two doctoral students in their early stage of writing had only drafted one chapter with an embedded literature review at the time I was collecting data. The other two students (one master's degree student and one doctoral) who were close to defending selected the chapter that had the most embedded secondary sources through direct quotes. They emailed me their drafts a few days before text-based interviews. Text-based interviews are an important supplement if one investigates citations (Polio & Friedman, 2016). After the text-based interview, I asked the participants to reflect on their experience writing literature reviews and incorporating direct quotes into their texts (Appendix D).

Textual Analysis

Analysis of participants' literature review sections focused particularly on where they incorporated direct quotes into their texts using what rhetorical moves and strategies (Kwan, 2006) and serving what rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007). To understand more clearly where L2 graduate writers place the quotes (Kwan, 2006) and for what rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007), I analyzed direct quotes through the moves and strategies outlined by Kwan (2006) (Appendix A). Kwan's (2006) model is a modified version of Bunton's (2002) and Swales's (1990) models used in theme-based literature reviews of Applied Linguistic dissertations written by native-speakers and is made up of three rhetorical moves in three categories: establishing a territory for one's research, creating a research niche, and occupying a niche. These moves are similar to Swales's (1990) original Create A Research Space (CARS) model. In addition to rhetorical moves, Kwan's model also uses rhetorical strategies, which are described in more detail below. Since the participants' literature reviews were embedded and theme-based, Kwan's model was most

suitable for this study. The textual analysis that investigates academic genre, such as literature reviews, research articles, dissertations, or theses, through moves and strategies has been used many times in the past two decades (Polio & Friedman, 2017). Strategies in Kwan's model are considered optional and not sequential.

The best known approach for identifying parts of the text through moves and steps is Swales's (1990) CARS model, which defines moves as "a discoursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent and communicative function in a written or spoken discourse" (p. 228). Swales's CARS model consists of three moves: establishing a territory, establishing a niche, and occupying the niche. In the past, Swales's CARS model underwent many adaptations that depended on in which genre and discipline the model was implemented. One of the most modified CARS models has been Bunton's (2002) model, which added more rhetorical steps, such as defining terms, indicating a problem or need, purposes, aims, or objectives, to the CARS model. Also, the occurrence of the moves and steps was found to be more recursive (Bhatia, 2001; Samraj, 2002), and particular steps were identified as optional and not sequential in many genres in social science disciplines (Bhatia, 2001; Kwan, 2006).

The rhetorical functions of direct quotes in this study follow Petric's (2007) taxonomy of rhetorical functions (Appendix E), which was established based on Thompson's citation typologies that divides citation into sub-categories based on linguistic and functional criteria. In particular, the functional criteria divide citations according to the writer's intention for using them in their own texts (Petric, 2007). Also, non-integral citations are those that do not name the author in the sentence but place the name as a parenthetical citation, such as source (attribution), or refer to origin, reference, or example, which can also indicate citation function and writer's intention (Petric, 2007). The rhetorical functions of citations usually match the rhetorical

functions of rhetorical moves and steps (Ozturk, 2007). Also, low proficiency writers tend to use rhetorical functions of citations that show only attribution functions rather than exhibit more advanced rhetorical functions, such as establishing links among sources, that are present in the work of more proficient writers (Petric, 2007).

Data Analysis

All of the audio-recorded interviews with students were transcribed by me with the help of Rev Services, which provides professional services for audio transcription, video captions, and document translation and was recommended by two doctoral colleagues. I transcribed the interviews myself to preserve the accuracy of students' interviews and, especially, their own voices. Informal analysis began when I was first listening to the interviews, taking notes, writing summaries, transcribing them, making marginal comments, and highlighting important segments of the interviews where possible codes might emerge. Formal analysis started when the transcripts were coded according to established research questions. During the first two rounds of coding semi-structured and text-based interviews, I established preliminary codes and sub-codes for semi-structured and text-based interviews. The coding was inductive and thematic and driven by a recursive process in which codes were developed, evaluated, and revised (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Because the coding was driven by a recursive process, it was flexible and occurred in two cycles. The first cycle included looking at the data and categorizing it into thematic groups that were given codes such as *Writing workshops* and *Participating in guest speakers' lectures*. In the second cycle, the thematic groups were combined into one group and the codes were changed. For example, *Departmental writing workshops* and *Participating in guest speakers' lectures* became *Participating in departmental activities*. The textual analysis of literature review drafts

was coded first for rhetorical moves and strategies (Kwan, 2006); later direct quotes found in moves and strategies were given rhetorical functions following Petric's (2007) taxonomy. The data analysis of interviews, both semi-structured and text-based interviews, was a recursive process that continued during the dissertation writing process.

Semi-structured Interviews

The analysis of the data started with listening to semi-structured interviews. While listening to the interviews, I took notes on how students learned about L1 and L2 source use in their disciplines at universities in their home countries and how they learned about source use in their disciplines at the U.S. universities. I mostly focused on how much they have learned about writing literature reviews and the use of direct quotes in their own disciplines in L2 at U.S. universities. At that point, I had already addressed the first two research questions framed according to the theoretical framework of LPP. These two research questions targeted source use, particularly how direct quoting in literature reviews of theses and dissertations is learned and used by L2 graduate students in their academic disciplines.

As a novice scholar, I found this early stage of listening and re-listening, taking notes, and summarizing helpful for the next stage of transcribing. During transcription of the semi-structured interviews, I divided data into groups established while forming interview protocols such as *Writing experiences from the American post-secondary institution* or *Knowledge of genre (thesis/dissertation) and sub-genre (literature review)* (Appendix C). After transcribing, I read and reread the transcriptions and began coding the data inductively through the recursive process, looking for any emerging codes. During preliminary coding, I created categories in the form of questions that were related to the three research questions. For example, four categories were related to my first research question: (a) *What L2 graduate students learn about source use*

in literature reviews in their home countries, (b) How L2 graduate students learned about source use in literature reviews of theses and dissertations at the U.S. universities, (c) What L2 graduate students do when they use sources, particularly direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations and, (d) What L2 graduate students do when they write embedded literature reviews of theses and dissertations.

Forming these categories and codes related to these categories was not an easy process, but my research advisor and a second coder assisted with redefining and finalizing the categories and codes (Appendix F). For example, *How L2 graduate students learn write Theses/Dissertations* and *How L2 graduate students learn to write literature reviews* became one category—*How L2 graduate students learn to write literature reviews of theses and dissertations*. In the end, this category was the most pertinent in terms of the first research question. I also redefined and finalized the codes for each category with the help of the research advisor and second coder. For example, under the category *What L2 graduate students do when they write embedded literature reviews of theses and dissertations*, I combined various codes such as *Purpose of a literature review*, *Structure of a literature review*, and *Finding relevant sources* into one code: *Reading to learn to write embedded literature reviews of theses and dissertations*. Also, under the category *What L2 graduate students do when they use sources, particularly direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations*, I combined various codes of *Reading for content knowledge*, *Writing to incorporate direct quotes*, and *Writing to use sources in rhetorical functions* into *Reading to learn to write in direct quotes*.

Text-based Interviews

The analysis began with listening all recordings, taking notes, summarizing students' answers, and grouping these summaries to describe them more precisely under headings. The

data was then re-examined in its entirety and coded. I coded the interview data thematically and inductively while looking for emerging codes. I was able to establish the category ‘What L2 graduate students do when they use sources, particularly direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations,’ which is relevant to the second research question (Appendix F). I continued to consult with the research advisor and second coder when coding text-based interviews.

Textual Analysis

Creating three criteria for identifying portions of the literature review helped in selecting the target text for analysis. The criteria are based on the three move structures of literature reviews proposed by Kwan’s (2006) model as follows:

- Move 1 establishes one part of the territory of one’s own research by either surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims, or claiming centrality, or surveying the research-related phenomena
- Move 2 creates a research niche in response to a move one by counter-claiming, gap-indicating, asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed, or asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one’s own research, or abstracting or synthesizing knowledge to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework
- Move 3 occupying the research niche by announcing by research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses, theoretical positions/theoretical frameworks, research designs/processes, interpretations of terminology used in the thesis (Kwan, 2006, p. 51).

Kwan (2006) described a move as a segment of a text that “has a local purpose, but also contributes to the overall rhetorical purposes of the text” (p. 36). In this study, each text segment (Kwan, 2006) as a move was determined based on the purpose of headings and subheadings of

the analyzed literature reviews. For example, one of Liz's headings in her embedded literature review—Theorizing Resistance against Socio-environmental Destruction—discusses the development of her theoretical framework. The direct quote was placed under the subheading New Political Society. Therefore, the direct quote was identified in Move 2, creating a research niche, since Liz's purpose was to develop the theoretical framework.

Additionally, a direct quote was placed in a paragraph of the subheading of Move 2, creating a research niche, where Liz synthesized knowledge claims to develop her own theoretical framework. She used the strategy of Move 2, abstracting and synthesizing knowledge claims, to establish a theoretical position or theoretical framework. Liz used a few contextual clues that helped identify the strategy, for example: "to reiterate that mainstream movement approaches such as resource mobilization, political process, antisystemic, and framing, and social construction" Thus, it is clear that Liz was synthesizing knowledge from secondary sources. She eventually used a direct quote in this strategy that had an evaluative function (Petric, 2007). The contextual clues such as "abandoned" helped me to decide what rhetorical function this direct quote served.

Coding of Literature Review Drafts

Headings, subheadings, paragraphs, sentences, and contextual clues in the students' literature review drafts provided identification markers for moves and strategies. After the moves and strategies were identified, I found direct quotes placed in the moves and strategies based on Borg's (2000) taxonomy, which distinguishes brief direct quotes (less than 40 words) from extended (longer than 40 words). I included any multiple quotation fragments in a single sentence that "show[s]writer's syntactic dexterity. The result is a novel sentence, which is the student's own creation built with blocks of other authors' discourse incorporated within it. The

appropriate stretches of text elevate the discourse to a more expert level” (Petric, 2012, p. 111). I excluded any quotation fragments (Petric, 2012) that were terminology (usually 1-3 words), short strings “consisting of two or three words containing common everyday words” (Petric, 2012, p. 110), and direct quotes from students’ footnotes. Also, references to primary sources, such as literary works or interviews conducted by students, were not considered (Petric, 2007).

After I identified direct quotes, I analyzed their rhetorical functions based on Petric’s (2007) citation taxonomy of rhetorical functions (Appendix E). Petric (2007) based her taxonomy on Thompson’s (2001) taxonomy that considered rhetorical functions of only non-integral citations categorized as source (attribution), origin, reference, and example. Petric (2007) used these categories for initial coding of non-integral and integral citations in low- and high-graded theses written by international graduate students in the field of gender studies in Eastern European countries. I used Petric’s (2007) final scheme for coding direct quotes, which is slightly different from Thompson’s (2001), ending up with the following categories: attribution, exemplification, further reference, statement of use, application, evaluation, establishing links between sources, comparison of one’s own findings or interpretation with other sources, and other (Appendix E). I was also curious to see whether the purpose and functions of moves and strategies matched the rhetorical functions of direct quotes.

Intercoder-Reliability

To test the reliability of the coding, I invited a second-coder, who is a PhD student in Rhetoric, Writing, and Linguistic with a focus on second language writing, to code portions of two selected interview transcripts and one literature review draft in order to achieve intercoder reliability as outlined by Miles and Huberman (1994). The work focused on four sections: two interview transcripts from semi-structured interviews and two interview transcripts from text-

based interviews, which were difficult because they included many codes that overlapped. I also randomly selected one draft of a literature review and met with the coder six times, including two initial informative meetings. In the first informative meeting, I explained the whole research project, the research questions, and the LPP theoretical framework with its concepts of a community of practice, transparency, and legitimacy. During the second informative meeting, I showed the coder the coding scheme for semi-structured interviews and text-based interviews with one coding scheme for both interviews since some answers from study participants overlapped in both interviews. We thoroughly reviewed the coding schemes to ensure she understood each coding category. I then elaborated on the provided definitions of LPP and its concept of a community of practice, transparency, and legitimacy and provided examples from other interviews.

When we met for the coding session of students' interview transcripts of semi-structured interviews and text-based interviews, we obtained 85 % reliability on the first transcript of semi-structured interviews and 92% reliability on the second transcript of semi-structured interview using the formula:

$$Reliability = \frac{Number\ of\ Agreements}{Total\ Number\ of\ Agreements + Disagreements} \#$$

The inter-coder reliability of both transcripts satisfied Miles and Huberman's (1994) requirement of 80%. This process allowed slight changes in the wording of a few codes, such as calling the code *Learning in informal teaching settings at U.S. universities* instead of *Learning from theses/dissertation advisor*.

Coding the text-based interviews reached 75% reliability for the first transcript and 70% for the second transcript. I initially intended to divide the category into multiple codes such as

Reading to learn for content, Reading for sources, Writing for sources, and so on. After I discussed these initial codes with the second coder, she suggested thinking about the participants' use of direct quotes as a practice in which reading for content knowledge, reading for sources, and writing about sources are not separate processes. In fact, coding them as separate processes became difficult since they frequently overlapped. In the end, the codes all seemed to intertwine as one recursive model of writing. She suggested that I have only one big code that reflected the use of the direct quote as a process where reading, writing, and researching happened recursively, and I followed this advice. In the next round, we obtained a higher reliability of 80% for the first transcript and 95% for the second transcript. Additionally, we coded the most difficult draft following Kwan's model (2006) and Petric's (2007) taxonomy, which obtained 95% reliability.

This process of coding and analyzing texts reveals how important it is to have another coder. The assistance of the second coder in this study helped to refine my categories and codes and brought her own experiences with coding interviews and writing drafts of second language speakers to the current project. While coding and analyzing, I also started to work on outlines for Chapters Four and Five that present results and discussion sections. The semi-structured interviews were straightforward to code. During the writing of Chapter Four, I added two codes, *Learning in formal teaching settings in students' own countries* and *Learning in informal teaching settings in students own countries* under the category *What L2 graduate students learn about source use in literature reviews in their home countries*, which clarifies the answer to the first research question. Finding the codes and redefining the codes for the second research question presented a greater obstacle in constructing meaning out of how students use direct quotes. Since I used text-based interviews and textual analyses to answer this research question,

combing, analyzing, and organizing the data became something of a challenge. It became difficult to keep each student's own voice through during interpretation and coding in the way necessary to retain an accurate understanding of their source use.

CHAPTER FOUR

LEARNING FROM A PERIPHERAL TO CENTER:

THE USE OF DIRECT QUOTES IN LITERATURE REVIEWS

Chapter Two provided information on the complex tasks of writing literature reviews and using source materials faced by L2 graduate students. To understand how L2 graduate students learn about and use direct quoting, it is not enough to research it through linguistic and rhetoric features (Hyland, 1999; Thompson, 2001; Tribble, 2001; Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013; Samraj, 2013). It is important to investigate two aspects: how students learn about direct quoting both in formal and informal teaching settings, and how they use direct quotes in literature reviews. This chapter presents results that address the first two of the three research questions:

1. How do L2 graduate students learn to use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations?
2. How do L2 graduate students use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations?

This chapter presents the stories of the four study participants—Liz, Joice, Sara, and Ernest—to reveal how they have learned to use direct quotes in literature reviews, especially when they enter their disciplines as newcomers from a periphery (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). It also investigates how some occluded features referred to as non-transparent features of literature review writing defined in Chapter Two (Swales, 1996; Badenhurst, 2019) impact students' learning about direct quoting in literature reviews and their use of direct quotes in various rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007).

The first part of this chapter answers the first research question by drawing on semi-structured interview data to delineate how the participants learned about source use in literature

reviews in their home countries and how they learned about literature reviews of theses and dissertations at U.S. universities. The second part of the chapter addresses the second research question by discussing what the participants did when using sources, particularly direct quotes in literature reviews. Responding to these two questions creates a coherent narrative of the four participants about their past and present experiences with learning about academic English writing, source use, and literature reviews both in their home countries and U.S. universities. While the primary focus is on learning and use of direct quotes in literature reviews in students' current context, this chapter also describes students' past experiences with learning about source use in general. Their past experiences within the contexts of their previous academic institutions are important for understanding each participant's overall learning. Furthermore, the results from text-based interviews and textual analysis describe what the participants quoted, where they placed direct quotes in a text, and for what rhetorical functions they used direct quotes. Excerpts from the interviews with participants as well as excerpts from their literature review drafts illustrate the results. These excerpts are original in order to maintain the participants' voices.

How L2 Graduate Students Learn About Source Use in Literature Reviews in Their Home Countries

As explained in Chapter Two, LPP is described as learning in participation in social practice situated into a community of practice, such as a student's discipline. This type of learning is not always harmonious and can be conflictual and challenging for many newcomers. In fact "disagreement, challenges, and competition can all be forms of participation. As a form of participation, rebellion often reveals a greater commitment than does passive conformity" (Wenger, 1998, p. 57). During the process of learning, newcomers give a new meaning to a

practice through either a communal negotiation or resisting the power relationship between them and experienced members (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002).

It is evident that learning about source use in literature reviews in students' own disciplines is not an easy task, especially for L2 graduate students who are newcomers to their own disciplines. The newcomers with their various educational, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds bring new perspectives to a process of participation in social practice, which also means that participation in social practice varies across disciplines with their various contexts of communities of practice.

It is also important to mention that a newcomer—a legitimate peripheral participant—automatically becomes a member of a discipline from a periphery with all legitimate and transparent access to learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). However, Morita's (2004) study found that not all students feel accepted as members of their disciplines, especially those with low language proficiencies. In fact, some students feel marginalized in their disciplines (Morita, 2004). Furthermore, not all members from the periphery are guaranteed transparent and legitimate access, and not all have a guarantee of a status of legitimate peripheral participant as members of their disciplines.

The four participants of this study have also been entering their disciplines from a periphery and have had been exposed to different knowledge about source use in literature reviews in their home countries and at their current university before beginning to write literature reviews in their theses and dissertations. Most L2 graduate students who start their graduate studies at U.S. universities are often mistakenly considered to be experienced writers (Belcher, 1994; Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000); however, their previous exposure to the practice of academic writing may actually be minimal (Dong, 1996, 1998; Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002;

Casanave, 2008; Kuwahara, 2008; Douglas, 2020). Those students who enter graduate studies with limited academic English skills can experience difficulties in participation in their disciplines. Possessing limited academic English skills and experiencing limited participation are reasons these students stay in a periphery for a long time.

The participants' reflections below reveal their past and present learning experiences before they embark on writing literature reviews in theses and dissertations, which presents not only how they learn but particularly how they learn from a periphery. This discussion raises the following questions: Do these students gain enough transparent and legitimate access for learning about source use? Do these students feel more as members with legitimate status from a periphery or more as marginalized members? How does learning about source use help them to establish themselves as members of their disciplines?

Learning in Formal Teaching Settings in Students' Home Countries

Before investigating how L2 graduate students undertake learning in U.S. universities, it is important to understand the role of their educational, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds (Dong, 1996, 1998; Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002; Casanave, 2008; Costley, 2008; Kuwahara, 2008; Zhu & Cheng, 2008; Douglas, 2020). These students' undergraduate backgrounds in their home countries can impact the way they write and use sources in graduate coursework when they enter U.S. universities (Dong, 1996, 1998; Casanave, 2008; Costley, 2008; Li, 2008; Zhu & Cheng, 2008; Douglas, 2020). As noted in Chapter Two, the transition from undergraduate writing to graduate writing is a very complex process for most graduate students, but students who are proficient in English academic writing and reading backgrounds undergo the transition more easily and adapt more quickly to new academic writing environments at U.S. universities

(Dong, 1996, 1998; Casanave, 2002; Casanave, 2008; Costley, 2008; Kuwahara, 2008; Douglas, 2020).

The majority of these participants for the most part described feeling unprepared to write in graduate coursework at U.S. universities, and they reported that their English academic writing classes in their undergraduate studies in their home countries were usually not helpful. Most of them considered undergraduate English academic writing classes to be too general and without sufficient writing practice and feedback on source use from their writing instructors.

Of the four participants, only Sara and Joice received undergraduate instruction in academic English writing, and that instruction focused minimally on source use across genres. Ernest learned about source use only at his current university and received his undergraduate degree from the same current institution. Liz was not offered any academic writing classes that would introduce her to academic English writing and source use in literature reviews.

Both Sara and Joice had a very similar experience while taking English academic writing classes at the universities in their home countries. Sara's class was supposed to prepare her to write in academic English; the focus of the class was to give students a broad understanding of how to structure an academic research paper in English, but only a short amount of time was allotted for source use. In this instruction students learned about source use mostly in the guidelines for citation, such as MLA or Chicago style, in order to avoid committing plagiarism. As Sara described her experience:

I learned how to write English, academic English writing and the, the teacher was American though, American teacher. And then he just, taught us like how to write the structure. But I think he didn't pay much attention to like the grammars or the choice of,

choice of the words. He was more uh, focusing on the structure... rules in English writing

I think, how to cite sources in different like AP, APA and, or Chicago.

Sara's description of the class seems to confirm the findings of Badenhorst (2018, 2019) who described teaching about source use in literature reviews among graduate students as primarily a set conventionalized citation rules that inform students mostly about plagiarism but not about how, where, why, and when to place sources in literature reviews (Polio & Shi, 2012).

Sara was introduced to the structure of a research paper as knowledge that could be transferable into writing in any other academic genre so that she came to believe that, as long as she acquired a very basic knowledge of academic writing, she would do well in classes at her current going forward. Her views about academic writing, however, changed when she took her first graduate class at her current institution when she discovered that she lacked practice in writing and source use across various genres. The most worrisome aspect of academic writing for her was that she was not sure how to use sources appropriately in her own writing and in her own argument. She did not know what information to include, or how, or where. She mentioned that she was never taught how to transform information from sources into her own writing and argument. As discussed in Chapter Two, a relevant study by Scardamalia and Bereiter (1987) referred to learning the stages of source use from knowledge telling to knowledge transformation. For many L2 graduate students, learning how to transform source use information into their own arguments takes a long time (Casanave, 2008; Costley, 2008; Kwan, 2009; Li, 2008). In fact, when Sara began studying at her current institution, she thought that she was still in a stage of knowledge telling.

Joice also took an academic English writing class, but the goal of his class was to prepare students for taking tests like the GRE or TOEFL. To prepare for the written sections of these

tests, he, too, was taught how to structure an academic research paper across various topics.

There was a belief similar to that in Sara's case that if students knew how to structure an academic research paper, they would be able to transfer that knowledge across various academic genres and topics. As Joice reflected on this experience of learning, he was convinced that the instruction did not prepare him for any kind academic writing at U.S. universities. He expressed doubts about the effectiveness of the class: "They gave us, you know, a layout structure for how to write those different topics, right? So they said, 'For any topic, as long as you use my structure in writing, you are gonna be good. You're gonna be get higher score. Right?'" Joice, like Sara, also mentioned that the class did not offer any practice that he was eventually in need of when he began writing in academic genres at his U.S. university. He repeatedly said that learning to write in his first language and in English at his university at home was "all about that formula, right? The writing is all about that formula."

Because Joice was taught to write primarily in his first language and in English only for exams, his main concern was writing well in exams in order to receive high scores:

...every time I wrote that small essay I got... So 50 is the full score, right...And I got, every time I wrote that, I got is 40, so I have 10 scores till the best, right... So my experience in writing Chinese is basically based on those exams, right. If we don't have those exams, I don't write Chinese, you know, I don't write.

Joice's writing instruction in both his first language and English focused on passing exams and receiving high scores from brief writing assignments such as short reports and narratives. Feeling unprepared to write in academic English, he entered his previous U.S. institution for his master's degree in sociology. He mentioned his struggles with writing course papers and his master's

thesis in English. Joice described writing his master's thesis as one of the biggest challenges he faced:

It was the first challenge, I think when I was writing my master's thesis at the end of my master program, right? So that was a big challenge. It was very struggle for me, but that's the first time I feel like struggle studying the American University..., I wrote the thesis draft first, and I sent her to my advisor, right? And so, I also send it to the writing center, right. And, there's a lot of revisions and I... At that was the first time you know, I feel like, 'Oh, my English is not that good,' right. My English was not that good as I expected when I was in China right?

Joice, who apparently felt somewhat confident about his writing at the beginning of his master's studies, very quickly realized that his academic English was not proficient. The example above seems to align with Morita's study (2004) in which a student participant reported feeling himself to be a marginalized member of his class due to low language proficiency. Joice also said that when he realized that his English was inadequate, he avoided participating in any class discussions, especially those that included native English speakers. He mentioned that he had never said anything in his classes, and when he entered his PhD program at his current institution, he felt pressured to participate because as a PhD student "it is important to participate when you are PhD." He admitted that he struggled to participate in written discussion forums and oral discussions. Joice often compared his writing with that of native speakers on writing discussion forums, which seemed to further diminish his confidence so that he has considered himself to be a marginalized member. At some point he came to accept the fact that he could never write like a native speaker of English until the idea became embedded in his self-perception.

These findings demonstrate that Joice and Sara did not feel prepared to write in academic English at their current institutions. They both believed that the instruction they received at universities in their home countries were explicit but lacked both sufficient modelling by the teachers and exposure to frequently used practices of writing and source use across more genres than academic research papers.

Learning in Informal Classroom Settings in Students' Home Countries

Liz, Sara, and Joice learned from their advisors and peers and from reading and writing on their own; all three approached learning from advisors and peers and on their own differently and not all were able to benefit from these learning experiences. Liz, who received her bachelor's and master's degrees in social science in her home country, learned about academic English writing and source use from her advisor and other professors and peers. While Liz worked on her bachelor's degree in social science in her home country, she was encouraged by her instructors to write her seminar papers and final exams in English. Although she never received any instruction on how to write academic research papers in English in her home country, she continued to work on her academic writing skills with the help of other professors in the social science department. Liz recalled this situation:

I started writing my exams in English first and my professor, professors encouraged me to write in English. When I saw that actually I am getting, or I'm doing good in exams while I'm writing in English, so I continued it. And of course, then there are some professors, two or three professors who encouraged me a lot to write always in English, especially like in academic stuff. So those things helped me.

Liz was encouraged to write all seminar papers in English by her advisor during her master's degree studies in social science in her home country. The constant support that she received from

her advisor resulted in Liz publishing an article in her first language and co-publishing an article in English with a professor from her university who had worked on his PhD in Belgium. Liz's learning experience through collaboration with more experienced members of her discipline is an example of learning as legitimate peripheral participation. As a newcomer from the periphery of her discipline, Liz learned successfully from participating in social practice through various activities of disciplinary writing. She also seemed to have appropriate transparent and legitimate access to learning supported by the more experienced members. However, she also expressed enthusiasm for her field, which was positively accepted by the more experienced members. This example shows that learning from a periphery is difficult for newcomers, but it is never one-sided learning. The participation must come from a newcomer and an someone who is an experienced and established member of the disciplinary community.

In the case of Joice, he was not encouraged to write any paper in English while he was working on his bachelor's degree in journalism in his home country and wrote his exams and final project in his first language. When he recalled writing his final project for his bachelor's degree, he described the lack of writing support from his advisor:

Actually no one tell me I have to do that. And even, even if we're, were assigned like uh, or assigned to advisors, I just, I just, went to her only one time and uh, and you know, you know, she said uh, 'You're, you're, you're good.' And then I was just preparing my, you know... I just, I didn't check any grammars for Chinese, I didn't check I mean thing, uh, for. So I just, uh, you know, I just uh, submitted everything...

Although Joice was assigned an advisor, he explained that he never received any feedback on structure, grammar, or even content that would help him better navigate writing in his first language.

Sara's experience of learning with her advisor was different from Joice's because her advisor provided more help and encouragement to write in English in her discipline in her home country. For example, she learned the appropriate use of words and how to avoid passive form, commenting that "there, there are some kinds of words we avoid or sometime, we don't encourage to use a passive voice in the history of writing because we always have to clarify the agency who did what...So that kind of discipline writing, I've learned from professors and also from the reading."

Despite receiving more help from her advisor in her home country than Joice did, Sara still did not believe she was well prepared to study in her discipline at her current institution; she did not feel confident enough to accept the role of a legitimate and established member of her discipline. She said that she did not know how to participate and compete with native speakers of English.

The experiences of Joice and Sara show that their participation in practices of academic writing in L1 and L2 has been marginalized because their advisors provided only limited transparent and legitimate access to full learning. Joice and Sara found that if they wanted to learn more about academic English writing and source use across more academic genres, they had to rely on their own efforts. This learning consisted mostly of reading articles and books in their disciplines on their own and emulating the academic writing they discovered there.

Sara and Joice did not pursue learning on their own in their own countries to any extent being mostly dependent on writing instruction in their academic writing classes. Moreover, they were not sure how to employ the knowledge acquired from their writing classes into further learning of source use in their own disciplines. For example, Joice explained, "I'm thinking about how you, you write in English, how you're supposed know how to follow that formula

[structure], to write the English paper, right. There's no formula in writing, right. How you could do that, right.” Since both of them lacked writing support from advisors, other professors, and peers who could be facilitators of learning in terms of making their learning sources transparent, they could not pursue much learning on their own in the way, for example, that Liz did. Liz was the only study participant who devoted a great deal of time to learning on her own in her home country. Liz described this experience in detail:

When I read something, I try to follow the style that the authors are following and what grammar, how they're constructing their sentence, how they're writing, you know... I try to be encouraged by their writing style I would say. So I learned by writing a lot, by reading a lot and of course through trial and error process.

Liz put an emphasis on learning from writing and reading (Hirvela, 2014). Although she was very skeptical about her preparedness to write in academic English before she entered her previous institution and current one, she still felt somewhat confident about her writing: “I was confident that I would be able to write because I did write in my, uh, in my back home. But compared to the level and the pressure of writing that exist in America, it's nothing in my back home.”

Scholarship on L2 graduate writing has confirmed that not all L2 graduate students enter graduate programs at U.S. universities prepared to write in various academic genres (Dong, 1996, 1998; Casanave, 2002; Casanave, 2008; Douglas, 2020). Many graduate students face challenges in writing when they transition from undergraduate coursework into graduate coursework (Casanave, 2008; Kuwahara, 2008; Douglas, 2020). In undergraduate coursework, students simply reiterate information from sources, which is knowledge telling, and are not asked to engage in knowledge transformation, or furthering the argument found in sources, as they

must do in graduate coursework (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987; Douglas, 2020). In graduate coursework, students are required to use more advanced reading and writing skills but are rarely exposed to these skills in undergraduate coursework. For L2 graduate students who are newcomers the lack of advanced writing and reading practices, adequate instruction in source use, and the lack of confidence cause difficulties when they enter graduate programs at U.S. universities (Casanave, 2008; Costley, 2008; Li, 2008; Kuwahara, 2008; Douglas, 2020). The results in this section show that the L2 graduate students' degree of preparedness use source use and writing in various academic genres when they enter their graduate programs is not only the reflection of students' English language proficiencies in reading and writing but also the result of students' previous teaching instruction in academic writing and source use at the institutions in their home countries or previous institutions in the U.S.

Joice and Sara did not lack the necessary English proficiency; instead, they needed more transparent and legitimate practice of source use and writing that would prepare them to write on a graduate level. Additionally, they needed to feel like members of their disciplines in the way that Liz did. Because Sara and Joice never received assurance when beginning their studies at their current institutions, they felt unprepared to participate in written or oral activities in their disciplines.

How L2 Graduate Students Learn About the Literature Reviews of Theses and Dissertations at U.S. Universities

This section elaborates on the excerpts from the study's semi-structured interviews and text-based interviews to triangulate the findings, specifically regarding the ways in which the participants learned about source use in their informal and formal teaching settings. The informal

teaching setting included working with their advisors, and the formal teaching setting included graduate coursework and L2 graduate writing classes.

When L2 graduate students in general start working on their theses and dissertations, they usually seek help from their advisors, rely on previous knowledge gained from L2 graduate writing classes and graduate coursework, and often consult writing centers and peers in their discipline (Casanave, 2008; Zhu & Cheng, 2008). Although most extant studies (Hyland, 1999; Thompson, 2001; Tribble, 2001; Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013; Samraj, 2013) have researched source use through the linguistic and rhetorical features of theses and dissertations, it is important to understand what and how L2 graduate students learn about the literature reviews of theses and dissertations from the time they enter their disciplines as newcomers and until they finish writing their theses or dissertations as more established members.

Previous research (Dong, 1996, 1998) has emphasized that L2 graduate students at U.S. universities are especially hesitant to seek more help from advisors and often end up writing their theses and dissertations in isolation. A few studies (Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 2002) have attributed this to students' various cultural and educational backgrounds. For example, the results from the semi-structured interviews in this study confirmed while that writing their undergraduate and master's theses research projects at the universities in participants' home countries, these students assumed full responsibility for their writing without the benefit of feedback or coaching. It appears to be uncommon for advisors and students to discuss the writing and content of thesis and research projects in the higher education institutions in the participants' home countries, while it is a common practice in the U.S. This difference is the reason why some L2 graduate students need more time to adapt to new disciplinary practices at U.S. universities. In order to successfully pursue graduate degrees at U.S. universities, L2 graduate students as

newcomers must closely work with their advisors who are the more experienced members. This relationship is crucial but not always harmonious (Belcher, 1994; Kwan, 2008).

Learning in Informal Teaching Settings at U.S. Universities

In this study, all four participants consulted with their advisors at U.S. universities about their writing but gave various descriptions of how advising helped them to use sources in embedded literature reviews of their theory chapters (Liz, Joice, and Ernest) and introduction chapter (Sara). Liz's embedded literature review in the theory chapter of her dissertation theorizes socio- environmental destruction and the resistance against it in neoliberal peripheral countries. She described the background and critique of political-economical approaches to socio-environmental destruction, which allowed her to subsequently theorize resistance against socio-environmental destruction in her chapter. According to Liz, political-economic approaches have prompted social and environmental destruction and, therefore, it was important to mention them and indicate criticism, gaps and alignments with her research. Joice also wrote an embedded literature review in his theory chapter that discussed the concentrated disadvantage of poor neighborhoods on employment, health, and education. Sara wrote her embedded literature review as part of the introduction chapter in her dissertation and while researching U.S. missionaries' impact on Christianity in Japan. Ernest applied the theory of "the art of government" from Foucauldian and Machiavellian concepts of government on the world of online games in the embedded literature review of his theory chapter.

Of the four participants, Liz seemed to be the most enthusiastic about writing literature reviews in her dissertation. When she first became a participant in this study she was finished with her final draft. She described how writing embedded literature reviews in each chapter were easier to write because the literature review focused on only the one theme of the chapter.

However, the embedded literature review that was the most challenging to write for Liz was included in the chapter where the theoretical framework for her study was developed and which brought together sources across various disciplines. She explained that many research topics in social studies are interdisciplinary, which makes using sources more difficult for writers. She drew on sources across disciplines, including environmental science, politics, and economics. She mentioned that selecting the right sources for her interdisciplinary topic and finding the ways to justify their use for her research were the most challenging tasks and that she often discussed her use of sources with her advisor:

When I met my professor day before yesterday, he recommended me at least three books for my theory chapter. I mean he read my theory chapter, then he told me, ‘Did you read this book? Did you read this book? Did you read this book?’ And he told me, ‘You will find this argument's pretty compelling in relation to your research.’

Liz said she received a great deal of feedback from her advisor on how to select and use sources in this chapter, a collaboration that was especially important for her during the time when she was reading, selecting sources, and forming her argument for the use the theoretical framework in her chapter. Commenting on this time when she was finding and selecting sources, reading them, taking notes, and discussing the contents of them with her advisor weekly, she said, “That period was very relaxing like you know, because I didn't uh, write yeah.” However, when Liz started writing she met her advisor less frequently, but she still discussed the content of sources and also their use of them in terms of their rhetorical purpose. She described the process as follows:

Like you know I do meet regularly but this regularity is not like once in a week. It depends. Sometimes only once in a week, sometimes even, even 20, 20 days. Like in 20

days because like I have to have something in my hand to send him...I write a chapter or I write half of the chapter or work some paragraphs then I send it to him. Then actually we meet to talk about my writing.

Liz often received comments from her advisor on source use. During this stage she found that using sources for critiquing and applying her argument in the literature review of her theory chapter was the greatest challenge. According to Petric (2007), these functions are crucial for writing a compelling argument because application is a good measure of a student's ability to connect an argument with a source and evaluation demonstrates the ability to critique. When Liz used sources in these functions, she relied on her previous knowledge of source use but also on help from her advisor. Kwan's (2008) study pointed out that when students write literature reviews they usually receive assistance with finding and selecting of sources. Students do not get enough assistance from their advisors in using sources by incorporating them into their own writing, connecting them, and supporting and expanding on the existing knowledge (Kwan, 2008). Liz felt lucky to obtain guidance in these areas, which also gave her more confidence in writing her chapter with the embedded literature review. When Liz learned from her advisor what to do with sources, writing literature reviews became much easier for her.

For instance, critiquing sources and adding her own contribution to already existing research became tasks that required many revisions in writing and thinking. Her advisor in this process was a facilitator who helped her to overcome these obstacles:

I identified or I talked about major theories or major perspectives that we have within sociology relevant to my discussion. But when it came to identify potential avenues that required further attention, it was a challenging task. Because I remember my professor a number of times sent the draft back to me saying that, 'you should be careful when you

criticize other people because if you don't make it clear, why are you criticizing them?...

And if you don't specify clearly your contribution, your criticism would not look good.'

You know what I'm saying?

Liz mentioned that her advisor suggested she map out the arguments of scholars she read on separate pages to understand how her contribution is different or similar from other scholars and where there might be gaps in the existing scholarship:

But this is not my contribution and my professors said well, but what did we miss in trying to identify?... Because if you bring him, try to contribute to the existing literature in sociology, you also need to see, tell readers that what did he miss that you are trying to identify it, right.

Joice who was in the early stage of his writing, met with his advisor almost weekly. He wrote his embedded literature reviews into chapters, and the most challenging aspect of that task for Joice was the chapter developing his theoretical framework. His struggles were different from those of Liz. When Joice had produced only three drafts of unfinished embedded literature review chapters, he still discussed the content of sources with his advisor who recommended some sources for developing his theoretical framework. Joice read a key text that became the backbone of his theory, and he wrote the first draft of his literature review based only on this book, explaining that "my advisor told me, 'you read this book, and then you start with the adaptation from this book'." However, elaborating on more sources became complicated for Joice. When he wrote his second draft bringing in more sources, he was disappointed with his writing, especially with his inability to use sources that would move from knowledge telling about sources to knowledge transformation (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987). He found it difficult to bring information from sources and make the information his own.

While writing his second draft, his advisor suggested he first summarize each source in one sentence and start looking for similarities and differences across sources. According to Joice, “She suggested to me to use one sentence to summarize each scholar's main focus.” Along with this advice to start summarizing the sources, his advisor also told Joice to start thinking about writing the literature review as a dialogue, but he was not sure what the concept of dialogue meant in practice when he started writing the literature review:

My advisor taught me about the literature reviews, so you should make your literature reviews like they're all of those scholars in that literature review, they're talking to each other in your literature view. So in your literature review, all of those literatures are talking to each other. It's a dialogue. It's a discussion, right?... So, the scholars are talking, you make them talking, you, make them discuss in your literature review. So that's what she taught me about that. And I was also, you know, doing this, following this, you know... I feel like, um, it's hard for me to make that measure. Right?

Joice relied on help from his advisor not only in content but also in grammar and organization. In the past, Joice also sought help from the university's writing center and his peers, but he was most satisfied with the comments from his advisor. Joice felt that his advisor could comment on both grammar and the content but getting feedback on content was very important for Joice. However, Joice sometimes felt embarrassed to ask his advisor for more help with his writing, especially in matters of grammar because “we are already expected to know how to write in academia, so asking for more help about what I should know is not good to me.” It was important to him to participate in his discipline: “Where we are [as PhDs], we have to read and we come to the class and discuss.” However, Liz realized that her weaker writing, reading, and speaking skills were problems that slowed her dissertation work and also became obstacles to

participating in her discipline. She was also aware that if she had received better writing instruction on literature reviews and source use in the past, then she would have struggled less during this process.

In comparison to Liz and Joice, Sara worked with her advisor but also with other members of her committee when she started writing her dissertation. In Sara's discipline, literature reviews are usually part of introduction chapters, and dissertations are written in book format. Sara had an advantage over Liz, Joice, and Ernest in terms of writing her embedded literature review because she based it on the dissertation proposal she had already successfully defended. However, the dynamic of the relationship she shared with her advisor was very different from the experiences of Liz and Joice. She discussed only content with her advisor and, like some students in Kwan's study (2008), she felt compelled to seek more feedback on content and selection of sources from other professors as well. She mentioned that her advisor was not an expert on the topic of her dissertation and, when she discussed her topic with him, she did not always get the advice she sought, which meant "that's the tricky part. Because professor, you know, advisor does not necessarily, a special ... is not necessarily a specialist of my field." In fact, Sara said that her advisor recommended she seek more expertise from other members of her committee and other professors in or outside of the department. Sara commented on this experience:

My advisor, thinks like maybe you should ask other people. So that is what I do, yes. And then they give me very good feedback... So, in my field, there is now more focusing on the US Japan relations, which is kind of out of his [advisor's] focus. So, uh, for that part I usually ask other scholars, professors who specialize like Japanese history.

Her advisor expected her to take the initiative and work on her own for the most part. Sara also revealed that it has been difficult for her to contact other professors and receive any additional feedback from them. Coming from an Asian culture, she sometimes did not feel empowered enough to contact experts in the field, and she thought she would be more comfortable if her advisor helped her to contact other professors. Additionally, the greatest concern for her was that she felt unprepared to write the dissertation in English, a worry that made her seek help in the university writing center, and she was able to find a tutor with whom she has been discussing her writing almost weekly.

Ernest wrote his thesis as an M.A. student, and the experience with working with his advisor was different from those of the other study participants:

My relationship with my advisor and chair was always more on the personal level than on a professional level so to speak. We talk about things from ... Well, yeah, we talk about general things and sort of particularities of academic affairs. Occasionally, I would submit a paper and they would do some editing or point out directions I might take.

Ernest did not want to adhere to academic writing conventions because he found them boring, which led him to write his embedded literature review and his whole thesis as fiction, about which he commented that “when it comes to academic writing, I treat it very much like fiction writing.” Ernest felt lucky that his advisor and committee members allowed him to write his thesis using a narrative style:

Fortunately, I have a chair that doesn't care much about format. So necessarily, I don't ... Naturally, I don't have to pay that much attention of format. And I can present my, well somewhat organized thoughts and reflections on a certain theme and present the work to

the committee members...And as for the formal format, I did read some of them, the thesis, previous thesis and the department members who graduated from the department. When he elaborated on working with his advisor, he repeated a few times that his advisor is “always quite busy. I know I never had any expectation on him. I very much take it upon myself. I have to embark upon myself.” Ernest wrote most of his chapters without any feedback, and he never expected his advisor to provide much feedback.

Clearly, all four participants had quite different experiences working with their advisors, a finding that reveals the complications L2 graduate students may face in managing their relationships with advisors. In an example of the more detrimental consequences, both Joice and Sara reported that they were afraid to ask for more writing help from their advisors because they felt that their advisors expected them to already know how to write. This perception led them to seek support from writing centers and L2 graduate writing classes. However, not all participants found L2 graduate writing classes helpful; in fact, most of them found writing in the graduate courses of their disciplines to be the most beneficial. In explaining the reason for this, they said they preferred to discuss writing with experts in their fields rather than with experts on writing.

Learning in Formal Teaching Settings at U.S. Universities

All four participants learned about source use in the context of either or both L2 graduate writing classes and graduate. Ernest and Sara never took any graduate writing classes specifically designed for L2 graduate students, and they both learned to write in their disciplines only in their graduate coursework at U.S. universities. Although Ernest took L2 undergraduate composition classes as an undergraduate student, he said that he did not remember anything from these classes and that they were not helpful.

Joice and Liz learned about source use in graduate writing courses designed for L2 graduate students by learning about writing in various academic genres. Liz worked in her graduate writing classes mostly on secondary research papers that she compared to literature reviews. Kwan's (2008) study found that graduate students often mistakenly compare writing literature review chapters in their theses and dissertations to writing research papers based on secondary sources. It will be evident in the next section of this chapter that all four participants had difficulty distinguishing between a conceptual understanding of a research paper based on secondary sources and literature reviews of theses and dissertations.

Joice practiced using sources through writing book reviews and annotated bibliographies related to the topic of his interest in his graduate writing classes, but he found his graduate coursework much more valuable in terms of learning to write. Joice did not find book reviews especially helpful, mentioning that generally these assignments did not teach him much about using sources, such as how to incorporate, select, and find sources. On the other hand, he produced a publishable paper during his graduate coursework, which he considered to be better preparation for writing his dissertation.

Sara had a different experience, finding it helpful to read and write book reviews in her graduate course. She also wrote a seminar paper for her graduate course work that taught her how to use sources. Overall, all four participants found their graduate coursework to be more helpful than graduate writing classes in terms of learning about source use. For instance, Joice found that any graduate coursework had a positive impact on his future writing in his own discipline.

As mentioned in Chapter Two, when students begin to write literature reviews of theses and dissertations, they face many obstacles, including linguistic, methodological, ontological,

and conceptual challenges (Chen et al., 2016). L2 graduate students struggle with appropriate sources use for two key reasons: encountering occluded features and limited teaching instructions in source use across students' disciplines. Beaufort (2004) underscored that in order to overcome these challenges, students must acquire genre knowledge or discourse community knowledge by participating in the practice of various tasks and activities of a discipline.

However, as found in this study, not all students receive instruction on source use in literature reviews. If the pedagogical attention did include source use, students learned mostly about textual borrowing in the context of avoiding plagiarism and about the three methods for incorporating sources into a text—paraphrase, summary, and synthesis. According to Barks and Watts (2001), this “limited triadic model” asks students to use these skills only in isolated practice that does not exercise their knowledge of source use in terms of how information from source can be accompanied in various contexts of writing assignments and in the disciplines (p. 252). The study added that the limited triadic model “ignores the need for students to acquire a sufficiently deep understanding of how texts are used in various academic and professional genre, thereby failing to prepare students to carry out source-based writing assignments effectively” (Barks & Watts, 2001, p. 253). Pennycook (1996) argued that teaching ESL students about source use by just following certain accepted norms for averting plagiarism is “intellectually arrogant” (p. 227).

In the current study, the consequences of limited and isolated practices of source use caused the L2 graduate student participants to struggle, especially in their home countries, with how to transfer their limited source-use knowledge in literature reviews into a practice of their disciplines. Some studies (e.g., Badenhorst, 2018, 2019) have identified not only insufficient and ineffective teaching instruction but also the occluded features of writing literature reviews

mentioned in Chapter Two as hinderances for L2 graduate students in learning the conventions of literature reviews. These features are often hidden from newcomers of a discipline and are the reasons why L2 graduate students face the above-mentioned challenges and why participating in practice of source use in literature reviews for them is difficult. The study participants also found that when they worked with their advisors, they were able to learn a great deal; for example, Liz had a very good working relationship with her advisor. On the other hand, Joice, who found the work with his advisor beneficial as well, was not always able to follow the advice and comments he received, such as when he did not understand the concept of dialogue for writing literature reviews. The relationship worked better for Liz because she had plenty of previous experience with writing. Therefore, it seems easier for professors to advise students like Liz than someone like Joice who has had less experience with writing and source use.

What L2 Graduate Students Do When They Use Sources, Including Direct Quotes, in Literature Reviews

The previous sections of this chapter reported perceptions of how this study's L2 graduate student participants learned about source use and literature review writing in graduate coursework at universities in their home countries and U.S. universities as well as in graduate writing courses specifically designed for L2 graduate students and working with their advisors. The last sections of this chapter draw on results from the text-based interviews and textual analyses conducted in during this study in order to answer the second research question about how L2 graduate students use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations, specifically how and in what rhetorical functions the participants used direct quotes. The focus here is on the reading, writing, and thinking strategies the participants employed when they quoted. Furthermore, this section discusses where in a text they placed direct quotes and using

what rhetorical moves and strategies (Kwan, 2006), as well as why they used direct quotes rather than paraphrasing or summarizing.

Reading to Learn to Write in Direct Quotes

The use of direct quotes in literature review sections of theses and dissertations is a complex process, and every participant in this study used direct quotes for different rhetorical purposes and engaged in different reading, writing, and thinking strategies for integrating quotes. The way the participants used direct quotes depended on their knowledge of source use and citation competence, which was mostly impacted by their reading and writing proficiencies. They perceived the need to cite their source material in slightly different ways: Liz, Joice, and Ernest viewed it as a way to form their theoretical framework, and Sara to expand on existing research and form a main argument for her introduction chapter. As Liz commented:

So, when I know my argument, then I can do it clearly and like on citing...you know, uh, I'm using a major theorist for slow violence. Like the violence that is prolonged, violence that is uh, that takes place over time, you know. And so the question is like, you know what I am doing, I am looking at a disaster that have long term consequences. You know what I'm saying?

The participants felt most confident about strengthening their arguments through the use of direct quotes when they found and read scholarship relevant to their research topics that provided a good understanding of their research topics and developing theoretical framework.

When the study participants began to use direct quotes in their own writing, they relied primarily on reading comprehension of a borrowed text because that kind of reading led to learning about their research topic. All four of them said that without reading and rereading sources they could not continue writing and using direct quotes. When they decided to use direct

quotes, they found relevant sources, reading and rereading them, forming, strengthening, and rethinking arguments, and selecting and placing direct quotes. It was evident that reading and writing in the process of using direct quotes was not a linear process for these L2 graduate students, a conclusion that confirms the findings of previous studies (e.g., Kwan, 2008; McCulloch, 2013).

The participants in this study frequently went back and forth among the processes of reading, writing, forming, and re-thinking the arguments before placing direct quotes into their own writing and using them to serve rhetorical functions for their own purposes. Critical reading, understanding of the research topics, and contributing to existing research seemed to play important roles in deciding how to choose and place direct quotes in their own writing and in establishing themselves as more experienced members of their disciplines. This finding was also confirmed by various studies that found that reading ability increases citation competence but also that reading is always connection to writing. Ma and Qin (2017) explained this link as follows:

Citation is a type of comprehensible output based on academic reading, because, whether academic reading or academic citation, they both require a full and precise understanding of the academic knowledge, and this understanding further requires the readers' and writer's critical thinking, i.e. the ability of analysis, generalization, inferring, hypothesizing and evaluation (p. 231).

For the participants in the current study, critical reading and writing were crucial literacy skills for the use of direct quotes while writing embedded literature reviews. Various studies have shown that if students' reading and writing proficiencies are higher they use sources more easily and effectively (McCulloch, 2013; Ma & Qin, 2017). According to Ma and Qin (2017),

the individual factors that influence the citation competence of L2 graduate students are cognitive proficiency of source use, academic writing and reading proficiencies, and citing motivation. Cognitive proficiency of source use has been investigated from the perspective of effective and appropriate source use, and it was found that students with low cognition of source use have a tendency to plagiarize, even if unintentionally (Ma & Qin, 2017). As mentioned in Chapter Two, unintentional plagiarism is often considered to be a learning stage that has a positive impact on gaining citation competence (Howard, 1999; Petric, 2012). In addition, research has indicated that students' motivation to cite usually stems from their wish strengthen their argument for rhetorical and pragmatic purposes (Ma & Qin, 2017).

In this study, the participants used direct quotes very differently from previous studies (Petric, 2007; Petric, 2012; Harwood & Petric, 2013). As mentioned above, the use of direct quotes depended on a participant's citation competence, acquired mostly through reading and writing proficiencies and on an understanding of the research topic and chapter content. The content of the chapter was based on the participant's understanding of how to develop theoretical frameworks—what is relevant to read, what is relevant to quote, and how to quote it. Additionally, the ways in which the study participants used direct quotes was impacted by where they were in the writing stage of their literature reviews. The variety in all of these factors yielded a diverse set of literature review drafts (Table 1). Liz and Ernest presented final drafts, and Joice and Sara, who were both still in the early stages of writing, presented their third drafts. In addition, the drafts contained variations in the number of direct quotes used and the rhetorical functions the quotes served (Appendix E).

Sara was still in an early stage of writing and used almost the same number of direct quotes as Liz, which indicates that Sara was still in a stage of learning that often relied too much

Table 1

The Use of Direct Quotes in Students' Literature Review Drafts

Participant	Draft version	Number of direct quotes	Type and number of rhetorical functions of direct quotes (Petric, 2007)
Liz	final draft	Seven	attribution (two) evaluation (two) application establishing links between sources (two) statement of use (one)
Joice	third draft	five	attribution (four) application (one)
Sara	third draft	eight	attribution (eight)
Ernest	final draft	twelve	attribution (twelve)

on her source material. For a master's degree student, Ernest seemed to use too many direct quotes instead of relying on his own interpretation of sources. Joice did not use many direct quotes and did not feel confident when he did use them.

As the most experienced writer, Liz presented a final draft and also used direct quotes for a variety of rhetorical functions, such as application, evaluation, attribution, statement of use, and establishing links between sources (Petric, 2007). On the other hand, Joice and Sara were still in the drafting stage and did not use direct quotes in a variety of rhetorical functions. Sara used direct quotes for attribution only, and Joice used them for the purposes of attribution and application. Like Liz, Ernest also presented a final draft but was unable to use direct quotes exhibiting a similar variety of rhetorical functions. He presented information from sources but did not expand on the information or connect it to his main argument, and he only used direct quotes as attribution.

The results of textual analyses of the participants' literature review drafts confirm the findings of previous studies (Peters, 2011; Petric, 2012; Petric & Harwood, 2013). First, master's theses are usually products of knowledge telling instead of knowledge transformation (Peters, 2011). Second, the overuse of direct quotes is a sign of a source use learning stage for L2 graduate students but also presents an opportunity for them to start establishing themselves as experienced members of their disciplines (Petric, 2012). Third, the use of a variety of rhetorical functions is essential for L2 graduate students, especially when they want to establish themselves as experienced members of their disciplines and producers of a new knowledge (Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013). The more students employ a variety in rhetorical function of direct quotes students, the better they can present themselves as experienced members of their disciplines (Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013). Furthermore, the use of sources in a variety of rhetorical functions also shows students' ability to transform knowledge from sources and not just tell knowledge (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987; Zhu & Cheng, 2008, Douglas, 2020).

Students who can transform knowledge from sources are also considered to be more experienced members of their disciplines who are able to move from the periphery to the center and, therefore, to full membership (Casanave, 2008; Fujioka, 2008; Zhu & Cheng, 2008; Douglas, 2020). For example, Liz finished the final draft of her embedded literature review and demonstrated the most experience in the use of direct quotes. She said in describing her use of direct quoting, "So, you know, using direct quote is very useful sometimes because when we quote someone directly when we think some parts of the analysis are directly aligned with what you're trying to say, right?" Liz always tried to choose powerful and relevant direct quotes to form her argument, but finding the appropriate quotes was preceded by a great deal of reading

and writing, drafting, revising, thinking, and forming and understanding of her research topic, followed by developing the theoretical framework in her theory chapter.

During the text-based interview, I asked Liz to point out a quote in her dissertation and explain why she decided to use it. Liz selected a quote from a famous literary critic that served the rhetorical function of statement of use (Petric, 2007). The following is the quote as she used it:

How, in other words, can we rethink the standard formulation of neoliberalism as internalizing profits and externalizing risks not just in spatial but in temporal terms as well, so that we recognize the full force with which the externalized risks are outsourced to the unborn? (Nixon, 2011, p.35)

Liz used this quote to open her theory chapter and built her argument around it in a way that allowed her to justify the use of the theoretical framework for her dissertation. During this process, she was able to justify the quote's relevance to her argument by deconstructing the quote into various sections that she then connected to her argument. Liz's writing showed the characteristics of critical reading and writing in her use of sources. In other words, she was able to not just tell but also transform knowledge from sources into a rhetorical function and a context that ably supported her argument (Ma & Qin, 2017). These skills are usually considered to be signs of citation competence (Ma & Qin, 2017). She commented on the selected quote:

This is basically what I'm trying to say. For example, he said, 'How, in other words, can we rethink the standard formulation of neoliberalism as internalizing profits.' That corporations are garnering profit, you know?... At the, ex- expense of what? By externalizing the risks. So, this is basically what I was trying to say, that this quote is pretty powerful to me in this regard. Do you understand my point? You see the next part

so that we recognize the full force with which the externalized risks are outsourced to the unborn, the kids or children.

Liz was able to justify the selection of the quote for her argument, but she also extended the context of her study. She demonstrated her citation competence when she attended to both the context of her study and the context of the source quote.

Liz used a few more direct quotes in her chapter to perform various rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007), which enabled her to establish herself as a member of her discipline (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). The first excerpt below includes a direct quote by a major scholar in Liz's discipline that Liz used to develop her theoretical framework. The quote conveys the rhetorical function of evaluation (Petric, 2007) and is placed in the rhetorical move of creating a research niche (Kwan, 2006). The second excerpt includes a quote by another famous scholar; it achieves the rhetorical function of establishing links between scholars (Petric, 2007) and is placed in a rhetorical move of establishing a territory for his research (Kwan, 2006).

It is in this context important to reiterate that mainstream movement approaches, such as resource mobilization, political process, antisystemic, and framing and social construction tend to focus on the rigid, universal assumptions of social movements; they have largely "abandoned the idea of grounding qualitatively distinct kinds of politics in the analysis of social structures" (Levien 2013:356).

Foster rejected the traditional interpretation of Marx from scholars like Giddens (1981), who state that Marx adopted a "Promethean attitude" toward nature. In Foster's words: "Marx employed the concept of metabolic rift to capture the material estrangement of human beings in capitalist society from the natural conditions of their existence" (1999: 383).

Her use of direct quotes in these rhetorical functions enabled Liz to establish herself as a member of his discipline (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In addition to the rhetorical functions mentioned above, she used direct quotes for application and attribution (Petric, 2007). Liz understood that the use of direct quotes is not just for the purpose of supporting her argument, but also for expanding on existing research, contributing to existing research in the field, and evaluating existing sources. Petric (2007) also characterized the use of various rhetorical functions as a sign of citation competence and in advanced writers and readers.

Additionally, Liz also paid considerable attention to the organization of her chapter, which distinguishes her from the other participants. During the interview about this text she mentioned that understanding the organization helped her to place the direct quotes in better places. Liz also divided the embedded literature review of her theory chapter into headings and subheadings, which she said was the result of consultation with her advisor. The first two parts of her chapter were devoted to the introduction and background of her study. In the introduction Liz was created a research niche and used the strategy of counterclaiming (Kwan, 2006) by bringing in previous studies. By doing this Liz showed that she was able to compare different sources and identify the controversial issues. For example, she established links between sources (Petric, 2007) in the excerpt below from her introduction:

Even scholars who theorize resistance linked to accumulation by dispossession, such as David Harvey (2003), fail to account for the diverse conditions of resistance in peripheral countries. Unfortunately, some scholars, such as Slavoj Žižek (2009), criticize localized acts saying it's 'better to do nothing than to engage in localized acts.' Žižek clearly fails to decipher the system that leads to the emergence of a new kind of politics in peripheral countries.

This particular quoted passage could also serve the function of evaluation as described by Petric (2007), who noted that links between sources and evaluation often overlap; this excerpt is clearly an example of overlapping functions. Furthermore, in her background section Liz established the territory of her theoretical framework by surveying research-related phenomena (Kwan, 2006) and used direct quotes in functions of evaluation (Petric, 2007). For instance, the following excerpt from Liz's draft includes a quote from another scholar:

Although rift scholars' contributions to the critique of mainstream environmental sociology are significant, they "tend to overlook careful analysis of the material potentialities of the present in its insistence of what ought to be done" (White et al. 2017:13). Moreover, rift scholars tend to overlook the dialectical and inseparable nature of the nexus between society and humans in neoliberal capitalism. Some scholars, therefore, are critical of the nature-society dichotomy (see, Freudenberg and Gramling 1995; Gellert 2005) that rift scholars tend to underscore.

Liz used evaluative language from the source to critique the rift scholars. Also, she was able to establish and place her theoretical framework among other studies in the background section of her embedded literature review chapter by creating a research niche in which she used the rhetorical strategies of counter-claiming, asserting relevancy of surveyed claims, and abstracting and synthesizing knowledge claims (Kwan, 2006). In the background section of her embedded literature review chapter, Liz used direct quotes to function as application (Petric, 2007), which can be difficult to do successfully because it "makes connections between the cited and the writer's work in order to use the arguments, concepts, terminology or procedures from the cited work for the writer's own purposes" (p. 244). This advanced rhetorical function requires writers to have complete understanding of a source and the author's argument. Liz placed another quote to make

the rhetorical move of creating a research niche (Petric, 2007) and the rhetorical function of application (Kwan, 2006). This excerpt appeared in the second part of her embedded literature review chapter and includes a quote from a well-known literary scholar:

Nigeria is an oil-dependent nation as it relies on 96 percent of its export revenue and 80 percent of government income. However, of the people that live there, 85% of the wealth goes to a mere 1% of the population (Nixon 2011: 106), “almost none of whom belong to the micro-minorities who inhabit, ingest, and inhale the ecological devastation” caused by oil leaks.

Liz’s facility in using direct quotes to perform various rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007) also shows that she was able to easily transform knowledge elicited from sources instead of simply telling knowledge (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987). Regarding this, she explained: “It’s difficult. Unless you know your contribution clearly, it’s difficult to, uh, separate my words from theirs. But I think knowing the contribution was, knowing my own contribution.” In other words, Liz found that once she understood her own contribution, she could separate her own words from those of her other sources but still use the sources for her own purposes. As she explained:

When like, you know, your contribution, it is not very difficult to separate your own words, you know. Um, uh, but I think first what is important to know what is in other’s work and what is important in your own work. Uh, this distinction is very important. Then I think it helps you like, you know, keep your contribution.

In Sara’s case, using direct quotes was not an easy process. At the time Sara was recruited for this study, she was still working on a third draft of the embedded literature review of her introduction chapter. Like Liz, she did a good deal of reading and rereading of her sources in order to understand her research topic and form her main argument. Sara’s embedded

literature review was divided into two sections: the history of U.S. imperialism and the history of Christianity in Japan. In the introductory chapter, Sara mostly used secondary sources, but when an author of secondary source used a primary source reference, she consulted the primary source. Her goal was to see how her interpretation of a primary source aligned with or diverged from the secondary source author's interpretation. Sara commented on this experience as follows:

I try not to cite primary associates from the secondary sources. So if like I want to use this primary source, which is used in another secondary sources, I will try to get to the primary sources and read it and see how author interpreted the source differently from me.

Sara also observed that in the study of history most direct quotes are drawn from primary sources and secondary sources are usually summarized or paraphrased, adding,

I think like if someone's notes or diaries or letters or like speech and that, that could, really show some of the points of my argument, I quote, but I think other than that, I think I can explain myself, in my own words.”

In this way it is clear that she found direct quoting from secondary sources to be problematic because it was less familiar to her.

Sara's research also dealt with a more obscure area of the history of Christianity in Japan because the existing research has covered various other topics as well. In this case, Sara experienced difficulties in forming the main argument and finding relevant direct quotes to support that argument, as she described:

I couldn't find a good quote [laughing], you can also face like a lot of problems when you have multiple authors that they look at things from variety of perspectives, like selecting the direct quote and when you have a multiple authors, variety perspectives, it is harder to

select the good quote that really would not deviate from your arguments. It is much harder when you have to have, when you have variety of authors or different themes. These reasons led Sara to use direct quotes only in the section about the history of U.S. imperialism. She explained that the extent of knowledge about of U.S. imperialism has been well-established and that “there were like the previous works on the historiography of the U.S. imperialism too and there is also consensus among historians like how these works were challenged by other works like there is this kind of consensus already.” Even though forming the argument was easier for her in this section, using direct quotes was still troublesome.

She struggled most with the placement of quotes; Sara felt that in some parts of her text, the quote was not placed properly and believed that the draft still needed revising. Sara particularly mentioned that some quotes still need to be better introduced and with better explanation. She also described the difficulty that she had experienced with commenting, explaining, and introducing a quote; she mostly associated explaining, commenting, and introducing a quote by simply rephrasing the quote. As she described this process, “I can little bit rephrasing quotes but the usual quotes are there [laughing] like because they are better words so, yes, I had a hard time doing that.” Sara also admitted that knowing her both her argument and the context of her study better should help her to place direct quotes more appropriately and to serve a greater variety of rhetorical functions. Since she was just beginning the process of forming her argument and identifying the gap scholarship that would establish the theoretical framework of her main topic, she was still clarifying the territory of her research by surveying research-related phenomena (Kwan, 2006). This was also the reason she used all of her direct quotes only for attribution.

As mentioned previously, attribution is the easiest rhetorical function for students to incorporate into their own's texts (Petric, 2007). Sara asserted that even finding the appropriate quote and placing it in her own text was challenging. In the excerpt below containing a quote, it is evident that Sara had difficulty introducing and commenting on the quote, but more importantly in connecting the quote with her own argument:

Following historian Frederick J. Turner, who proclaimed in 1893 that “American democracy was based on free lands; these were the very conditions that shaped its growth and its fundamental traits,” historians positively evaluated that American expansion into “free land” was essential for the distinguished American character— American democracy.

In this excerpt, Sara used direct quote fragments that she inserted into her own text, a practice that Petric (2012) called a sophisticated version of patchwriting but also a sign of trying to contribute to existing research. Sara certainly demonstrated the features of an effective use of direct quotes, but she was still struggling, especially with the flow of her own writing when she inserted the original quote.

Similarly, Joice experienced difficulties with the use of direct quotes while writing his third draft, difficulties that resembled Sara's. Joice noticed that finding relevant sources was challenging for him, especially as he was still forming his own argument. Joice said that it was important to know the argument first before “you could start looking for relevant direct quotes.” He added, “If there are very useful sentences, the direct quotes, I will use it, but I haven't found them in those articles. Yeah. I'm still gonna go back to the sources, uh, because this is not a finished one.” Re-reading sources made Joice eventually feel more confident in using direct quotes.

Joice was also aware that the placement of direct quotes has to be done by first introducing the quote and also explaining it. Joice was convinced that the best way to use direct quotes was only in the middle or end of a paragraph and when the quotes operate as a summary of a source. He explained these perceptions in the following way:

When I was using the quotes I feel like, um, you know, most of the time it's supports my argument. My argument comes first and then comes to the quotes and explanation. I use quotes in the middle... Your writing teacher will probably tell you, like, in the middle there should be supportive arguments. And the supporting arguments are the quotes for me. I also use quotes at the end of the paragraph, but that's not ... that's the only function as a summarization. Like, a generalization of a paragraph.

Most of the quotes Joice used had the rhetorical purpose of attribution, and in some cases he used direct quotes when he was not sure how to paraphrase or summarize. The example below from his draft includes a quote from a prominent scholar:

In the final policy chapter, he warned that “three centuries of injustice have brought about deep-seated structural distortions in the life of the Negro American” and that the “present tangle of pathology is capable of perpetuating itself without assistance from the white world. The circle can be broken only if these distortions are set right (Moynihan, 1965, Chapter 5, pp.1) Otherwise, he argues that once set in motion, racially linked poverty is a trap that reinforces itself and can be broken only by structural interventions. (Moynihan, 1965, Chapter5, pp.1).

Joice admitted that he wished to use quotes for more rhetorical functions than just of attribution (Petric, 2007), but he also admitted he was not able to do it yet. He was also aware that he sometimes overused quotes. Petric (2012) and Howard (1999) considered the overuse of quotes

to be a learning stage for novice writers. Joice expressed a similar view, “Because I’m afraid, my—my argument is not, is not right. So I need support from the, you know, all- all of those published articles or, you know, I’m struggling with, you know, I develop arguments and I’m struggling.” The comment shows that an understanding of argument is a key aspect of the successful use of direct quotes. Joice had difficulty forming his own argument and supporting his argument with sources. He repeated many times during the text-based interview that he wanted to learn more about how use direct quotes by reading other scholars and imitating their writing style. He believed that reading and rereading sources would help him to construct his argument and theoretical framework.

When Joice excerpted a quote and explained its relevancy and function, he selected a passage from a major work to develop his theoretical framework, explaining, “Because this quote can clearly express what I, what I was trying to say.” The passage he pointed out follows:

Among two-car middle-class and affluent families, commuting is accepted as a fact of life; but it occurs in a context of safe school environments for children, more available and accessible day care, and higher incomes to support mobile, away-from-home lifestyles. In a multitiered job market that requires substantial resources for participation, most inner-city minorities must rely on public transportation systems that rarely provide easy and quick access to suburban locations (p.39).

It is obvious that Joice used this block quote as a substitution for his own words but not for the purpose of showing how other works align with or diverge from with his own argument. Joice commented on this:

This quote gives me an exact example to what, you know, what the difference is between have cars as a family, and then not have cars as a family. Right. So if they have cars, they

can go to work. You know, sometimes I use a direct quote, not the, not the whole paragraph, but you know, one sentence or two sentences, um, because I think, um, the sentence or the argument that the author is writing is very beautiful. Like it's very cut to the point. It's very exactly what I want to say.

Clearly, Joice was still in the process of learning to use direct quotes. Due to his less proficient critical reading and writing skills, he mentioned that he was always under pressure to submit drafts to his advisor on time. Petric (2012) pointed out that the pressure of time and students' inability to paraphrase or summarize make students overuse direct quotes and often with attribution as the sole rhetorical function. However, Joice was already aware of the recommendation to avoid overusing direct quotes or relying on authors' words, but he found that "it is very difficult because it's easy to be deviant. Like it's easy to be led away by the quote...there are very clear differences between, you know, the direct quote writing and my own writings." Joice also seemed to be that flow of writing could be adversely affected when he started to use direct quotes.

Similarly, to Sara, Joice was still establishing territory for developing his own theoretical framework by surveying research related phenomena (Kwan, 2006). However, towards the end of his third and unfinished draft, he began to create his research niche by indicating a gap but still used a direct quote in as attribution. To illustrate this, the excerpt below includes a quote from major scholar that Joice used to develop his theoretical framework:

In the 1960s, Daniel Patrick Moynihan brought up a renewed perspective to the stratification of the American inner-city. The basic idea of Moynihan is that he suggested the idea of reinforcing cycles of disadvantage, or can also be called "poverty traps" (Bowles, Durlauf, & Hoff, 2006; Sampson & Morenoff, 2006). Moynihan noted that "so

long as this situation persists, the cycle of poverty and disadvantage will continue to repeat itself.”

Joice was determined to keep reading and rereading more sources in order to gain deeper understanding of his topic. He believed that reading could help him to use direct quotes in a greater variety of rhetorical functions, to place his direct quotes into his own text more smoothly, and to better construct his argument and theoretical framework.

In comparison to Sara and Joice, Ernest had finished his final literature review draft embedded in his theory chapter. As a master’s degree student, Ernest used sources in his writing for learning new knowledge. He was driven by the idea that a quote must remain in its original form and not be evaluated. Because Ernest was also pressed by time, he was unable to read his sources in detail in the way Liz, Joice, and Sara did. He selected his direct quotes based on the argument of his chapter and intended to use sources for attribution because, as he explained, “So, you basically, when you know what your chapter is going to be, you go to your articles and books and select those that are relevant to the chapter... you had already in your mind like which, which sources you might be using for the chapter.” Ernest mentioned that he kept research logs from previous research papers that were related to his thesis topic that made it easy to find relevant sources since he was already familiar with the topic. Because Ernest was already familiar with most of his sources, he read them only once and wrote from them without rereading them or reconsidering their new role in his thesis. Referring to this, he said, “And, I read once and I write. And when I write I don’t read the content. I don’t read anymore. I don’t go back to the text anymore when I write. I already have the knowledge.” He did not seem to have enough time for re-reading as doctoral students should, but he was also unable to understand how

sources, particularly direct quotes, are used in the rhetorical functions of attribution and in his theoretical framework (Petric, 2012).

In the short excerpt below, Ernest used three quotation fragments for the rhetorical function of attribution (Petric, 2007). In addition, he overused direct quotes:

Greek concept—episteme, which refers to knowledge about the world; in techne it is the “intentional action that constitutes a gap between the world as it was before the action, and the new world it calls into being” (ibid., p.55. Emphasis original). The purpose of techne is therefore, to bring something hitherto absent into being, to create “what nature found impossible to accomplish” (Guattari, p.33). Technology, from this perspective, is thus “any intentional extension of a natural process ... Respiration is a wholly natural life function, for example, and is therefore not a technology; the human ability to breathe under water, by contrast, implies some technological extension” (Beniger, p.9).

According to Petric (2012), use of multiple quotation fragments is “a way of emulating or appropriating the discourse of the discipline, which the student is not yet capable producing herself [himself]” (p.110). Quotation fragments show a student’s “syntactic dexterity,” (Petric, 2012, p. 111) and “the result is a novel sentence” (Petric, 2012, p. 111) that consists of text blocks from various authors’ discourse that elevate the student’s writing to “a more expert level” (Petric, 2012, p. 111). This practice is very close to patchwriting (Howard, 1999; Petric, 2012). In the case of Ernest, these quotation fragments were acknowledged and considered to be a sophisticated version of patchwriting as he selected passages and combined them but did not modify them (Petric, 2012). This practice is also as patchwriting (Howard, 1999) part of learning process of to use sources as an expert.

Similar to Joice and Sara, Ernest was reading and writing from sources for the purposes of knowledge telling rather than knowledge transformation (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987), and he used his direct quotes for the rhetorical function of attribution in order to establish the territory of his research by surveying research-related phenomena (Kwan, 2006). Because he was a master's degree student, Ernest needed more time to absorb the knowledge of his research topic to be able use his direct quotes more effectively.

Conclusion

This chapter examined how the study participants learned about and used direct quotes in their embedded literature reviews; none of them learned specifically about direct quoting in their L2 graduate writing classes or graduate coursework. Instead, they seemed to learn about direct quoting and use of direct quotes mostly from reading scholarly articles. During this process, the students relied a great deal on imitating the writing styles of scholars and employing patchwriting (Howard, 1999), both of which have been considered learning stages of source use (Howard, 1999; Petric, 2012). These results suggest that teaching direct quoting should be introduced to L2 graduate students through more explicit writing instruction in their graduate coursework and L2 graduate writing classes.

When they used direct quotes, they relied on knowledge of their research topics and their own arguments, and it was only when they felt that they knew the content of their sources well that they were able to select quotes and place them into their own texts. However, the successful placement of quotes also depended on the organization of their literature reviews. The effective use of direct quotes in their embedded literature review chapters was also influenced by their ability to read, write, and think critically. Liz, who used direct quotes for a variety of rhetorical functions, also demonstrated that she was able to present not only information as a direct quote

from a source but also present information through direct quotes by placing them in the context of her own study. In comparison to Sara, Joice, and Ernest, Liz exhibited confidence and the critical skills of reading, writing, and thinking that marked her as a more experienced member and emerging expert in her discipline. Liz did not always disregard the voices of other experts; in fact, she was able to use those voices to strengthen and support her own. Her ability to use direct quotes as a means of knowledge transformation allowed her to move from initial peripheral participation to full participation in practices and assume full membership in her own discipline (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

CHAPTER FIVE

UNDERSTANDING OF LITERATURE REVIEWS

AND USE OF DIRECT QUOTES AMONG L2 GRADUATE STUDENTS

Chapter Four explained how the four study participants learned about source use, particularly direct quoting, and how they used direct quotes in their embedded literature reviews. Building on the results discussed in Chapter Four, this chapter delineates how the participants' conceptual understanding of literature reviews of theses and dissertations and their citation competence help them establish themselves as members of their disciplines. According to Bruce (1994), the conceptual understanding of literature reviews is divided into two parts, the first of which is the process of writing, including the writing of literature reviews related to finding, collecting, and analyzing sources. The students in this study usually had not had much instruction in the process of writing literature reviews. Second, Bruce (1994) considered effective literature review writing was accomplished when students begin synthesizing sources and incorporating their arguments with those of their sources. When students gain a substantial conceptual understanding of literature reviews, they demonstrate a professional grasp of existing research but also acquire the ability to contribute new knowledge to their field (Bruce, 1994).

The data in this chapter was obtained from text-based interviews and textual analyses. The goal of this chapter is to answer the third research question: To what extent does understanding the use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations help L2 graduate students to establish themselves as members of their disciplines? The answer to this question stems from understanding how reading and writing for learning are important in students' ability to use direct quotes in literature reviews and acquire a conceptual understanding of embedded literature reviews. The results discussed in this chapter demonstrate that writing

embedded literature reviews in theory and introduction chapters was a way for the participants to learn how to establish themselves as members of their academic disciplines. Specifically, the results reveal that successful participation was dependent upon the participants' conceptual understanding of literature reviews; once they gained such conceptual understanding, they read, wrote, and used sources more effectively. The effective use of sources as studied in this and other studies (Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013) signifies students' ability to contribute to an existing research of their disciplines and to help L2 graduate students to establish themselves as members of their disciplines.

Reading to Learn and Writing to Learn Embedded Literature Reviews of Theses and Dissertations

For the four study participants, learning to write embedded literature reviews consisted of various literacy activities such as finding sources and selecting powerful, meaningful, and relevant passages from sources by underlining or highlighting them. Writing to learn included summarizing and synthesizing sources and organizing them according to theme. All the participants shared the goal of finding sources written by recognized experts in their fields. These sources were important to ensure that the participants had read the experts recognized by experienced members in their disciplines and, as a result, they understood that using these types of sources in their writing contributed to their development as scholars. For example, Liz wrote about one of the more well-known scholars of her discipline as follows:

He did a pioneering research on Amazonian rainforest in Brazil. And he coined the term ecological unequal exchange in 1985. His contribution within the sub discipline of environmental sociology is very powerful. So this is the reason I, I mean even though my research is not like, you know, directly aligned with his risks, but it is considered a lot of

the classics, you know, sub discipline. And I must need to identify some aspects from his work as well.

The process of reading to learn to write literature reviews for theses and dissertations was considered by the four participants as a period during which they initially learned about the topics of their research studies. Once the students established an overview of their research topics, they were able to emphasize the purpose of their embedded literature reviews. Studies show that the purpose of literature reviews varies across disciplines and genres (Swales, 1990; Swales & Lindeman, 2002; Swales, 2004). For instance, literature reviews in hard sciences are usually short summaries of sources with an emphasis on experimental results, whereas the purpose of literature reviews in theses and dissertations in humanities and social sciences is argumentative (Kwan, 2006).

In this case, the participants studying social sciences were supposed to support and evaluate sources and contribute new knowledge acquired through research that could build on existing knowledge. For example, Liz, Joice, and Ernest sought to address a gap in existing research, fill the gap by expanding on previous studies in their sources, and develop their own theoretical frameworks. This can be a difficult task even for experienced students like Liz, who commented on the challenge: “[T]his part was difficult for me to identify my contribution in relation to other existing part for literature.” In the end, Liz reached her goal and was able to develop her theoretical framework and contribute to existing research. Her experience reveals that writing embedded literature reviews takes a long time, a great deal of hard work, and perseverance. However, studies have found that not all students can successfully address the gap and contribute to existing research, especially if they do not have enough guidance from their advisors (Bruce, 1994). For example, at the time when the study interviews were completed

Joice was still searching for a research gap and needed more time to identify his own contribution. Ernest was prepared to defend his thesis, but his thesis did not show any signs of contributing new knowledge. One sign of this was that all the direct quotes he presented in his embedded literature review simply reiterated the information of his sources. Peters' (2011) study asserted that most master's degree theses are simply presentations of knowledge gathered from previous work without offering any new insights. Sara was still trying to expand on her secondary sources, address the gap in sources, and form a main argument that could contribute a new perspective on the topic to her research area. As for Joice, she needed more time to read, write, and research to get to the point when her embedded literature would be finished: she also had not received enough guidance from her advisor and sometimes felt lost.

As these participants were working on their embedded literature reviews, their understanding of embedded literature reviews in their chapters changed from a simple conceptual understanding of literature reviews as "a list of sources, a survey, and as research to a more complex understanding of literature reviews as a vehicle for learning and facilitating research" (Bruce, 1994, p. 221-223). The conceptual understanding of literature reviews of theses and dissertations has been investigated in L2 writing scholarship primarily through six categories of literature review concepts: "the literature review as a list, as research, as a survey, as a vehicle for learning, and as a research facilitator" (Bruce, 1994, p. 221-223). These categories are useful for describing how the study participants developed their understanding of literature reviews as they read more and wrote more drafts and as well as how the relationship between each student researcher and the literature varied. These relationships "are described in terms of direct and indirect interaction with the literature" (Bruce, 1994, p. 224). For instance, the concept of literature reviews as a list, a survey, and a search do not involve "direct interaction between the

student researcher and the literature” (Bruce, 1994, p. 224-225). In these cases the student researcher is simply gaining knowledge from sources without making any inferences or argumentative connections. On the other hand, in the conception of literature reviews as a vehicle of learning and a research facilitator, the researcher has a direct interaction with the literature. A student researcher “is working with source material, rather than, for example, a representative abstract” (Bruce, 1994, p. 224). In these pursuits the student researcher is able to establish research territory and research a niche in the subject by counter-claiming or synthesizing the source claims (Kwan, 2006).

The results of this study show that as the participants read more and wrote more drafts, they learned more about their research topics and the more advanced concepts of embedded literature reviews of theses and dissertations. At the same time the reverse is also true: the more they were able to understand the concept of embedded literature reviews, the more focused and purpose-oriented their reading and writing became. Kwan (2008) pointed to the fact that performing research by collecting, reading, and analyzing sources, as well as gathering and analyzing data, should be undertaken while writing literature reviews. Kwan (2008) wrote that “reading takes place in various points of doctoral journey for various purposes and that reading, writing, and research tend to develop in co-constructive manner” (p. 45). Although Kwan’s (2008) study showed that students usually postpone writing until the last stage of their research due to “the assumption that before embarking on writing, they need to have collected enough ideas to write about” (p. 43). This study found that as a result of constant drafting the participants moved between writing and reading, summarizing and reading, note taking and reading, and synthesizing and reading even in the initial stages of writing their literature reviews.

In the case of Liz, for example, the conceptual understanding of her embedded literature review seemed to change during the period of writing. At first, she thought “the purpose of the literature review in my discipline and probably in others as well, is to, is to examine the existing knowledge base.” As mentioned above, Liz was an enthusiastic writer who had more experience writing and reading in academic settings than the other participants. However, even for Liz as a more experienced writer and reader, her conceptual understanding of the theory chapter developed from perceiving the literature review as a list, survey, and research towards the concepts of seeing literature reviews as a vehicle of learning and facilitating research (Bruce, 2014).

Liz expressed feelings of fulfillment, excitement, challenge, and exhaustion as she worked on multiple drafts of her literature review chapter. She described his process in this way:

But writing a dissertation chapter where you have to embed your literature, or existing findings or existing literature, uh, came across really, um, very, uh, useful as well as very intellectually challenging...Sometimes as I said, so theory chapter, uh, particularly this chapter where I had to like, you know, dig into so many literature... I think has been one of the most exciting as well as a tiring task. Because my professor told me that this is, this is supposed to be the strongest chapter of your dissertation. I mean, he said, and it was important for me as well that, ‘It is the foundational chapter of your dissertation. You should spend more time on this.’

The important point here is that Liz felt responsible for producing a good chapter, especially a theory chapter that laid the foundation for her research.

Liz worked on about 15-20 drafts of her chapter as well as making revisions while developing the theoretical framework for her chapter, and she remarked that “reading has always

been accompanied by writing.” At the same time as she was reading and writing, she moved back and forth among the concepts of a literature review as “a list, survey, research, and vehicle of learning,” (Bruce, 1994) which confirms Bruce’s (1994) finding that gaining an understanding of literature reviews is a recursive process. Liz said that even when she was first reading to come to an overall understanding of the scholarship related to her dissertation topic, she often summarized and synthesized sources, eventually producing two to three free-write drafts as a result of her extensive reading, thinking, and learning. At that time, Liz took a further step and perceived her embedded literature review as a learning vehicle (Bruce, 2014). She commented, “You know, write the entire chapter, the entire document, suppose 10 pages or 15 pages without looking at literature. I just write it, write it and write it.” These free-write drafts allowed her to elaborate on the brainstorming ideas that eventually formed her theoretical framework. The free-writing she produced became drafts that she revised with her advisor. Writing freely in her own words made her feel that she brought her own voice and contribution to her dissertation and discipline. At the same time, when Liz wrote freely she already had sources in mind:

When I'm writing, I know this has been said by somebody, you know? Then actually I, I just refer to the name that I'm going to come back to this literature again. You know what I'm saying? And I continue writing. Then actually I go over the chapter again. See actually what I'm missing there. Who is missing and who needs to be integrated. Which, who's, which scholarship should I, should I cite or which source should I, must bring in this chapter? Then actually I go back to the scholars, you know, go back to their writings.

When Liz started to think about what sources to bring into the embedded literature review, she decided to incorporate those that gave her a direction for reframing her research questions and developing her own theoretical framework. Having more control over her ideas and writing, she

thought of the process of writing the literature review through the lens of a research facilitator. Deciding on what sources to include and how to critique them were important steps for Liz because she frequently discussed source use with her advisor as she learned what sources were appropriate to use in thesis and dissertation research topics. This was very important for Liz because she believed that if she used known scholars her work might also be viewed with respect.

In her final draft, Liz eventually reached the conceptual understanding of literature review as research facilitator and a report and was determined to act as a more experienced member. She identified relevant sources that were well regarded by her disciplinary community. Furthermore, she used sources in advanced rhetorical functions as they are used in research articles by experienced scholars. Her goal was to become recognized as a full member of her discipline moving from the periphery to the center (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998).

Compared to Liz, Joice was writing a third draft of his embedded literature review when he was recruited for this study; he was still thinking about his literature review through the concepts of survey, research, and vehicle of learning (Bruce, 1994). Joice struggled to know what sources to include, how to structure the chapter, how to develop his theoretical framework, and how to place his theoretical framework among previous studies. Due to his lack of knowledge in these areas, Joice sought help from his advisor who recommended that he write the literature review chapter of his dissertation as a dialogue between scholars and scholarly sources. Even though Joice was puzzled about the notion of a dialogue when he posed himself questions such as “How do I make my scholars converse in the text?”, he began to draft this chapter. Later he mentioned that even while writing his third draft, he remained a bit confused about the concept of creating a dialogue among his sources; he was still using the concept of dialogue to

form background knowledge about his theoretical framework. In writing his literature review he was driven by the concept of writing as a vehicle of learning, which has been postulated by the work of Bruce (1994). In fact, Bruce (1994) mentioned that “the three higher level conceptions [a vehicle of learning, a research facilitator, and a report], therefore, are closer to what a supervisor might wish the student to move towards” (p. 226). As Joice read and reread his sources, he began to see how the concept of dialogue was implemented by other scholars in books and articles—their writing became a model for his writing.

Joice also admitted, during one of the text-based interviews, that the difficulty he faced was in understanding how the concept of dialogue was related to his inability to synthesize various sources, an obstacle that led him to write the first two drafts based only on three major books. Joice considered synthesizing books easier than articles; when he read books first he was able to establish a solid understanding of his topic before moving on to more complicated articles. As he explained:

Because, um, you know, I'm framing arguments through their books and also their articles. You know, sometimes if you start, if you start to read a book and then read the scholars' articles, it will help you to understand those articles.

The three books written by two major scholars in Joice's topic became the foundation for his theoretical framework, and he believed that by engaging these sources he was slowly securing himself a position as a novice scholar.

It was obvious that connecting multiple sources was causing Joice problems during writing, especially when he started to produce the third draft that was the subject of the text-based interview. Joice was supposed to bring more sources into this draft, for the most part more scholarly articles, but he had difficulty with this step, expressing his doubts as follows:

Because I don't have a generalization, like, I do have in a book that says 'Okay, this is the concentrated disadvantaged and child development.' But I have to find those articles. I had to find those articles that relate to concentrated disadvantaged and- and child development and pull them together and find arguments and form own argument.

Joice tried to map out his argument and categorize his collected sources based on similarities and differences, describing the process this way:

The more you read, the more you know about what you are going to write down...you read the different articles. You put these similar articles, together, right? This is about this, this is about this. And then you underline important sentences in them. And then when you write you pick out those sentences from similar articles and put them together into your writing.

While writing his third draft, Joice was ready to use more sources in his writing, but he tended to use them only for the purpose of telling rather than transforming knowledge (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987). Joice understood his literature review through the concepts of a list, a survey, research and, eventually, as a vehicle of learning (Bruce, 1994), which indicated that he was still not competent enough to use sources effectively through direct quotes in a way that would secure him a position as an established member of his discipline. In the excerpt from his writing below, it is clear that Joice struggled to create a niche for his own argument by indicating a gap in the research. In this excerpt, Joice sought to elaborate on his theoretical framework by using a quote from prominent scholars in this field:

Since the social issues occurs within contexts, the individuals cannot be studied without a consideration of "multiple ecological systems in which they operate". (Brooks-Gunn et, al, 1993). Also, Sampson argues "sources of compromised wellbeing – such as

unemployment, segregation, poverty, and family disruption – are equally clustered in space” (Sampson, 2012, pp.100). Land et. al (1990) combine correlated structural variables into composite measures and report that in properly specified models, the structural covariance of homicide is reasonably “invariant” across time and space. In Land et al.’s analysis, the most robust structural predictors are the measures of resource deprivation/affluence, population structure (size/density), and family disruption (divorce rate).

Joice’s own argument got lost in the use of sources because he overused quotation fragments. He was still in the stage of mostly learning from sources and was unable to introduce his own views in connection with those of other sources.

In Sara’s case, writing the embedded literature review in her introduction chapter was similarly as demanding as for Joice. Since Sara’s purpose was to write an embedded literature review in the introduction chapter, she developed the main argument for her whole dissertation, which she did by addressing the work of previous research and looking for gaps. In this stage of writing, her literature review was comparable to Joice’s in that it served the concepts of a list, a survey, research, and a vehicle of learning (Bruce, 2014). Furthermore, due to a lack of assistance from her advisor and because her research topic was situated in a less established and less researched field, Sara felt marginalized and lacked the confidence to bring her own voice and argument together with her sources. Again, instead of transforming knowledge from sources, she told the knowledge (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987).

At the time of the text-based interview, she struggled to locate her sources and form her own argument. According to Sara, the area of research had not been fully established and finding

sources required her to go into other topics related to the history of education and history of women missionaries. Sara commented on this:

So I think the field of Japanese Christianity in this period is not very established I guess, so the topics covered in this field intervene with other fields... That's why, like they are not thinking like a historian does, so yeah, it is difficult.

Reading sources from a field with which she was not familiar required her to reread sources more often and take more detailed notes. While reading and summarizing sources, mostly by writing annotated bibliographies, Sara seemed to start thinking of her literature review in the terms of a research facilitator, but she had not been shown how to implement this concept in writing literature reviews; the concept of literature review as a research facilitator remained occluded for her (Swales, 1996; Badenhorst, 2018, 2019). A literature review that becomes a research facilitator demands that a student synthesize sources, but Sara did not feel confident about doing so. Because she did not receive much support from her advisor, she could not move to this stage. Bruce (1994) pointed out that “supervisors have a responsibility to clarify their own conceptions of a literature review and to guide their students' understandings of this part of the research process. It is more important that they adopt this role” (p. 227). Because Sara received minimal guidance on writing literature reviews, she constantly doubted whether she understood the purpose of her chapter, the content she included, and the writing style and word choice she used.

For Ernest, writing an embedded literature review in the chapter on theory consisted of reviewing his own previous notes and research papers related to his topic. When Ernest came into this study, he was finished with his final draft and had submitted it to his advisor. As mentioned in the previous section, Ernest did not often discuss his writing with his advisor and

did not want to adhere to the academic conventions of writing. He said that while writing this chapter he did not have any particular strategy: “I don't have any necessarily strategy. Sometimes I have a few main points, and sometimes I will list them out. Sometimes, I don't list them out.” Ernest found inspiration in other scholars’ writing, and his aim was to write like they did; basically he relied on reading and copying the writing style of other scholars.

Conclusion

This chapter highlighted how the participants participated in their discipline as they wrote their embedded literature reviews. The focus is on the participants’ conceptual understanding of literature reviews and how that understanding changes as they make progress in their writing. The results show that the participants who learned the concept of literature review as a research facilitator and report used sources for more advanced rhetorical functions. For example, Liz showed the most advanced use of sources in her writing. With hard work and help from her advisor, as well as enthusiasm and passion for her field, she eventually moved from the periphery towards the center of her discipline (Wenger, 1998) and was considered a more experienced member than Joice and Sara. Joice and Sara, were still struggling to understand the concepts of their embedded literature reviews and the use of sources in them, and both hoped to become more knowledgeable members of their disciplines. However, writing literature reviews still contained many occluded features for them (Swales, 1996; Badenhorst, 2019), such as the concept of dialogue for Joice, or concept of literature reviews as a research facilitator for Sara. On the other hand, Ernest did not have any desire to adhere to academic writing conventions and did not want to participate actively in his discipline. He thought of writing of literature reviews as mainly a form of personal edification.

The results of working with these participants indicate that it is important to pay attention to the relationship between a student and an advisor, especially during the process of writing literature reviews. Writing literature reviews is a complex process and students need to be listened to and led through the process. Because L2 graduate students are often mistakenly assumed to be experienced readers and writers, they may not receive much pedagogical attention (Belcher, 1994; Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000). For example, Joice and Sara were expecting more guidance on writing and research from their advisors. Although Joice liked his advisor, he said he wished he had been provided with more explicit guidelines. This findings of this study align with those of other studies in indicating the importance of teaching source use more explicitly across genres; in addition, this study found that the essence of source use is in helping the student writers understand how to participate in their disciplines. Many studies (Hyland, 1999; Thompson, 2001; Thompson & Tribble, 2001; Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013; Samraj, 2013) have considered only the rhetorical functions of source use for student writers, but it is also important to look beyond the text and to how source use and writing literature reviews form students' identities as future scholars.

Furthermore, it is essential to teach L2 graduate students about using direct quotes to serve specific rhetorical functions through the context of students' disciplinary genres, especially when students are involved in long projects such as theses and dissertations. The results in the current study also show that each participant and advisor contribute their own personal theories and experiences of writing literature reviews in theses and dissertations to the process. Given the significant differences that can emerge raises questions about how effective training in the writing of literature reviews can be provided for master's degree and doctoral students. Zhu and Cheng (2008) recommended that rather than teaching students the general features of literature

reviews, faculty members might discuss the successful features of literature reviews in specific contexts. Only when these features are explicitly discussed among advisors and students and the previous writing experiences of students and advisors are negotiated can L2 graduate students begin to understand literature reviews and source use (Zhu & Cheng, 2008). At that time, L2 graduate students will then be able to present themselves as experienced members of their disciplines.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study provide an understanding of how L2 graduate students from the periphery of their disciplines learn and use direct quotes in the literature reviews of their theses and dissertations. It also investigates to what extent L2 graduate students' understanding of direct quote use in literature reviews helps them to establish themselves in their disciplines. This study showcases how L2 graduate students as newcomers learn in formal and informal teaching settings of their disciplines. Additionally, it describes how L2 graduate students' conceptual understanding of literature reviews (Bruce, 1994) and competence to use and cite direct quotes in literature reviews allow them to participate in their disciplines. This study reveals how L2 graduate students as newcomers learn about direct quoting and the use direct quotes in literature reviews. Understanding this would allow teachers to consider ways in which they could help L2 grad students use direct quotes in literature and other academic genres more successfully, which in turn will help them move from the periphery of their disciplines to becoming more experienced participants.

The results in this study portray direct quoting as a complex process to learn, especially for newcomers in their disciplines. Direct quoting had seldom been taught to these four student participants, and they described how they struggled but also how they worked hard to eventually use direct quotes effectively in their embedded literature review chapters. Therefore, the study's results support teaching the importance of direct quoting, especially to L2 graduate students, through the context of a disciplinary genre. This finding confirms Barks and Watts's (2001) study that calls for a more contextualized type of learning and teaching about source use. For example, the four participants in this study could not use direct quotes to serve various rhetorical

functions (Petric, 2007) and place them in various rhetorical moves and strategies (Kwan, 2006) without possessing a conceptual understanding of literature reviews. The use of direct quotes in literature reviews also depended on the students' understanding of their research topics and related scholarship. The student participants seemed to rely primarily on reading and rereading sources, taking notes from sources, and underlining or highlighting passages in sources. These were good strategies in the beginning stages of writing their embedded literature reviews, but eventually they had to start writing their chapters and integrate their reading, writing, and research (Kwan, 2008) to successfully finish their chapters. The findings of this study support those of Kwan's (2008) study that encouraged L2 graduate students to start writing even during the research and data collection phases although most participants were hesitant to produce early drafts. Most of them did not feel confident about their writing and consequently did not engage with their source material by identifying and using direct quotes early in the process.

As a result, they were able to only reiterate information from their sources. Many students may work in the same way as Sara, Joice, and Ernest, placing direct quotes during the last stage of writing before they turned in their drafts to their advisors. This can be a sign that they think of direct quotes only as a function of attribution (Petric, 2007) that simply reiterate the information of the source. If students are to learn about and use direct quotes more effectively, it is necessary to go beyond the practice of attribution. On the other hand, in this study Liz was researching, writing, and reading at the same time and placing direct quotes throughout the process to perform a variety of rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007). This study's comparison of the way in which the participants learned about source use provided insight about the role that process plays in how L2 graduate student newcomers develop into fully accepted members of their disciplinary community; this leads to the recommendation of this study that direct quotes

use in literature reviews of theses and dissertations should be taught to these students as a recursive process of reading, writing, and researching strategies.

Theoretical Discussion

By utilizing the LPP social theory of learning, the study uncovered three main factors that contribute to a better understanding of how L2 graduate students learn and understand that the use of direct quotes in literature reviews shapes them as members of their disciplines. First, the results from the study show that as newcomers L2 graduate students face many difficulties when they try to establish themselves as members their disciplines by demonstrating their understanding of the effective use of direct quotes in literature reviews. Studies on source use have mentioned that L2 graduate students struggle most in adapting to a new disciplinary environment and with learning the writing conventions of that discipline (Prior, 1998; Casanave, 2002; Casanave, 2008). Prior (1998) found that most disciplinary writing conventions are conveyed to L2 graduate students though implicit instructions by the more experienced members of their disciplines who are professors in their graduate course work or are their thesis and dissertation advisors. One of the reasons disciplinary writing conventions, including conventions of source use, remain implicit for L2 graduate students is that more experienced members mistakenly assume that L2 graduate student newcomers are experienced readers and writers (Belcher, 1994; Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000). However, in the current study the L2 graduate students did not consider themselves to be experienced readers and writers, and all four expected more attention and clearer instruction on the use of direct quotes in literature review writing. They also felt the need to be advised more extensively on writing literature reviews of theses and dissertations to help them overcome these challenges.

Second, other findings of the study also show that being accepted as valued members of the discipline by more experienced members, such as advisors and professors, helps L2 graduate students learn about and use direct quotes with more confidence in becoming established members of their disciplines. For example, Liz, who felt welcomed by more experienced members of her discipline, used direct quotes in her literature review to serve various rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007). Liz also entered her discipline as a better writer and reader, which means that she was able to participate in oral and written discussions in class and have a better understanding of the use of direct quotes in her literature reviews. She also had a better conceptual understanding of the role of literature reviews in theses and dissertations. However, the other three study participants felt less accepted by the experienced members of their disciplines, and they used direct quotes for only one or two limited rhetorical functions (Petric, 2007). For instance, Sara and Joice entered their disciplines at their current U.S. institution as less experienced readers and writers and with many doubts about their preparation to write in their disciplines. They also used direct quotes in for the relatively simple rhetorical function of attribution. During interviews they admitted that they felt isolated and marginalized in their disciplines from the very beginning and were hesitant to participate more extensively, and they were even more hesitant to present themselves as legitimate members of their disciplines.

The feeling of not being prepared to use their sources effectively in literature reviews also apparently impacted Sara and Joice's relationship with more experienced members, including their advisors. For instance, Joice did not want his advisor to see that he had problems using his sources in his writing. Since he wished to participate more in his discipline and eventually become an expert in his field, he did not feel comfortable talking about his writing difficulties with his advisor. Sara expressed a desire to participate more in her discipline and to work more

closely with her advisor and other experts, but her lack of skills in using her sources and her insufficient critical reading and writing abilities hindered her from participating fully in her discipline (McCulloch, 2013; Ma & Qin, 2017).

The results of the study reveal the minimal attention that had been paid to students' previous writing experiences. In addition, the results show that as newcomers L2 graduate students who needed more explicit instruction in writing and source use skills did not feel welcome in their new disciplines. According to Simpson et al. (2016), advisors should be sensitive to students' needs and familiar with students' writing backgrounds so they can advise students better while writing their theses and dissertations. For example, when Joice asked his advisor for more help in writing literature reviews, he did receive help but the advisor's explanations were unclear. Since Joice felt that asking for more help would not be appropriate for his status as a newcomer trying to establish himself as a member, he ended up relying more on his own learning from reading and writing.

Third, the study also confirmed that learning in the disciplines seldom occurs without transparent and legitimate access to learning being granted to newcomers by more experienced members. The findings show that obtaining transparency and legitimacy also depends on students' previous experiences with source use, their relationship with their advisors, and their knowledge of scholarship. The study demonstrates that the more newcomers are exposed to transparent and legitimate learning, the more quickly and completely they become familiar with the skills of direct quoting in literature reviews. For example, Liz's previous writing experience and weekly meetings with her advisor provided her with valuable understanding about direct use of quotes in literature reviews. As mentioned above, during this study both Sara and Joice often expressed their feelings of marginalization at the very beginning of their studies due to their lack

of reading and writing experience in their disciplines. They also believed that these reasons obstructed the transparency and legitimacy necessary for them to learn about direct quoting from experienced members. Despite the difficulties Sara and Joice faced, they were determined to do well in their discipline, and they put a great deal of effort into becoming familiar with the scholarship of their disciplines on their own.

Sara, Joice, and Liz agreed that to be able to participate and work with experienced members of their discipline and to establish themselves as experienced colleagues with full transparent and legitimate access to learning, they needed to know everything about the scholarship of their disciplines. For example, Joice also believed that if he could demonstrate that he knew everything about the scholarship of his discipline, he could form a better relationship with his advisor. Critical reading skills were also very important for all four participants in gaining more understanding about their research topics and theoretical frameworks, as well as for increasing their understanding of direct quote use in literature reviews.

Practical Implications

As reiterated throughout this study, the participants faced various degrees of difficulty in learning about direct quoting and in establishing themselves as members of their disciplines by demonstrating their competence in direct quoting in literature reviews. The difficulties were usually the results of the lack of transparency and legitimacy they encountered in their disciplines, including difficulty gaining the acceptance of the more experienced members. The experiences of Joice and Sara in particular established these findings; the study participants' advisors who were the experts of the field were not necessarily writing experts or experienced in teaching writing. In order to improve the relationships between newcomers as L2 graduate writers and experienced members, the findings of this study suggest that graduate programs put

more emphasis on improving advising for L2 graduate students writing their theses and dissertations, such as offering writing workshops and writing groups. Graduate programs should also provide explicit and contextualized teaching instruction on source use, such as direct quoting, in L2 graduate writing classes and graduate coursework. In order to reach these goals, advisors, L2 writing specialists and professors of graduate coursework, students, and graduate studies directors must be involved. Below are detailed suggestions for how each stakeholder could address the current obstacles:

Advisors

- Advisors could be encouraged to seek cooperation and collaboration with L2 writing specialists on their campuses.
- Advisors could be better informed about any dissertation/thesis writing workshops or one-on-one sessions made available at their universities and should disseminate this information the students they advise.
- It is also important that advisors form a relationship with their advisees to bring encouragement and positivity into advisees' work. Advisors could create a relationship they and their students share and negotiate personal theories and experiences on writing literature reviews in theses and dissertations, including the use of source material. This process would help advisors to refine their understanding of the role of a major professor and “a facilitator in the reflection and negotiation of personal theories about the dissertation” (Zhu & Cheng, 2008, p. 146) that in addition to the many roles the major professor usually plays. Sharing and reflecting on personal theories—present and past—of writing theses and dissertations and source use would uncover various conceptual

understandings and misunderstandings. The differences could be negotiated by both parties and lead to greater confidence of advisees in their own disciplines.

L2 Writing Specialists and Content Specialists from Different Disciplines

- L2 writing specialists should cooperate with graduate programs, particularly with professors in programs across various disciplines.
- Each department could have one or two professors who would serve as content writing specialists who could regularly collaborate with L2 writing specialists and the tutors in writing centers or other coaching programs.
- Teaching source use, particularly direct quoting in literature reviews, should be more explicit situated in the writing contexts of L2 graduate students' disciplines. Barks and Watts' (2001) study observed that source use is seldom taught in the context of L2 graduate students' disciplines. One option to improve graduate students' writing is to offer more graduate interdisciplinary writing classes (Douglas, 2020) and more disciplinary writing workshops.
- Teaching content for both interdisciplinary writing classes and disciplinary writing workshops could be created in cooperation with L2 writing specialists and content writing specialists so that the classes would meet the needs and goals of each student. As part of preparing to teach the class, an L2 writing specialist would contact a content writing specialist in the students' department; together could create the content for the class. As a useful additional feature, the class could include a monthly consultation with a faculty advisor from each student's discipline.

- In interdisciplinary writing classes, students would learn how to transfer knowledge about source use into their own writing practices in their disciplines. In order to teach explicitly about source use, including direct quoting, and how to transform knowledge acquired from these sources, L2 writing instructors could incorporate analyses of arguments across multiple articles written by experts in the student's discipline. These students particularly need to learn both the sentence-level and higher-order skills needed to compose academic writing and use sources at the advanced level required for graduate school. L2 writing specialists should also focus on rhetorical conventions for research writing by asking students to analyze experts' writing and explore the conventions of source use in students' disciplines. Additionally, they could offer rhetorical strategies and provide extensive and developmental feedback on source use in literature reviews. Finally, it is important that they provide a safe space for newcomers' learning and allow them to learn from more experienced members of their disciplines (Douglas, 2020).
- In order to teach the skills of direct quotation, L2 writing specialists could teach students how to introduce direct quotes and how to comment on the quote. Scaffolding and examples of passages containing direct quotes that would come from students' articles would help students understand how to use sources and in what rhetorical functions.
- Additionally, interdisciplinary writing classes could be accompanied by teaching disciplinary-specific writing workshops organized by each department. These workshops would be taught by content specialists working closely with L2

writing specialists. Content specialists would assign research projects that could be turned into publishable research papers. They could also encourage L2 graduate students to do more peer-reviews in their workshops and one-on-one sessions in writing centers and working with other tutors.

- L2 writing specialists would need more training in teaching graduate writing classes. The current focus on composition studies has been on training L2 writing specialists to teach L2 undergraduate writing classes. This initiative must be supported because of a growing number of international graduate students, especially in the sciences (Douglas, 2020).

Students

- By taking an interdisciplinary writing class, students would learn general writing conventions, but the assignments could be adapted to the specific needs of students based on their disciplines and goals.
- Interdisciplinary writing classes usually have students from various disciplines, but studies have shown that these classes are still helpful to students (Douglas, 2020). For example, students learn to present a broader knowledge about genre, source use, and rhetorical expectations in their disciplines to an audience of various disciplines in the class, which requires them to be explicit about their disciplinary writing.
- Students could also be introduced to sections of research articles and theses/dissertations in order learn about the purpose and conventions of each section. Specifically, literature reviews sections would be introduced to them in various writing contexts so that students would learn how to form research

questions around a research gap and then address the gap. Teaching how to synthesize sources and manage argumentative writing would be a core of this class.

- Additionally, students could also do peer reviews and learn from each other about their writing conventions in their own fields in the interdisciplinary writing classes and disciplinary writing workshops. Peer reviews teach students to critique the writing of others and provide constructive feedback, which help students to acquire a position of a novice scholar and a competent writer in academic settings (Douglas, 2020). In addition, Douglas (2020) noted that “for students who felt insecure about their writing, having a supportive community created a ‘no-failure’ type of environment in which questions and suggestions were encouraged and accepted” (p. 82).
- Students could also be encouraged to present their research topics and talk about their sources in their writing projects in their interdisciplinary writing classes. Sharing thoughts about reading and writing techniques of source use and disciplinary writing conventions can evoke more constructive comments about writing and sources use among students from different disciplines during the process of peer reviews.
- L2 graduate students should not be afraid to discuss their writing difficulties with their advisors; studies (Dong, 1996; 1998; Casanave, 2002) have shown that students are more likely to share writing problems with L2 writing specialists where they may find a comfort zone. Both students and advisors could make an effort to change this pattern, a shift that could be affected if advisors viewed L2

graduate students as colleagues among fellow researchers in their disciplines.

Furthermore, L2 graduate students should start viewing themselves as colleagues by attending research conferences, research workshops, departmental guest talks, and other opportunities to participate with their disciplinary colleagues in activities in their field.

- Students could attend writing workshops on writing theses and dissertations, source use, and literature review writing organized by university writing centers and departments.
- Students could also consider forming writing groups, both general and specifically for writing theses and dissertations.
- Having regular and frequent meetings with theses/dissertation advisors during the process of writing theses/dissertation seems to be crucial for L2 graduate students.

Graduate Studies Directors

- The graduate schools and graduate studies of various departments could offer more writing workshops organized in cooperation with professors from departments and writing specialists on their campuses that focus on the needs of L2 graduate students.
- At the institution attended by participants at the time of this study, graduate students had the opportunity to attend writing workshops and writing groups organized by the university's writing center. However, the participants said they did not know about them, apparently because the graduate studies offices of their departments did not inform students about these opportunities. Directors of graduate studies could make a greater effort to inform L2 graduate students about

the writing support available to them, information that could be distributed to students regularly via emails or flyers.

Future research

Although source use has been widely researched in terms of its rhetorical and linguistic features, there is a need for more research on source use learning among L2 graduate students in various disciplines (Thompson, 2001; Thompson & Tribble, 2001; Petric, 2007; Petric & Harwood, 2013; Samraj, 2013). Furthermore, the results of this study confirm that understanding and use of direct quotes are complex processes for L2 graduate students to learn due to the limited pedagogical attention this intertextual skill receives in specific disciplines. Learning about direct quoting has been found to be a process that supports the efforts of L2 graduate students to establish themselves as members of their discipline. Newcomers to their discipline particularly struggle with this process, which indicates a need for further research of this process.

Future research could investigate learning about direct quoting from the perspectives of both more experienced members—such as advisors—and those of newcomers, especially L2 graduate students. Since this study only collected data from students over the course of three semesters, the results might be limited; ethnographic studies that took place over a longer period of time could reveal more about this learning process. Additionally, including more participants in future studies might uncover a greater variety of experiences students encounter when they use direct quotes in literature reviews in their disciplines.

REFERENCES

- Abasi, A. R. & Akbari, N. (2008). Are we encouraging patchwriting? Reconsidering the role of pedagogical context in ESL student writer's transgressive intertextuality. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27 (3), 267-184.
- Beaufort, A. (2004). Developmental gains of history major. A case of building a theory of disciplinary writing expertise. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 39 (2), 136 – 185.
- Badenhorst, C.N. (2018). Graduate student writing: Complexity in literature reviews. *Studies in Graduate and Postdoctoral Education*, 9 (1), 58-74.
- Badenhorst, C.M. (2019). Literature reviews, citations, and intertextuality in graduate student writing. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43 (2), 263-275.
- English doe Specific Purposes*. 13 (1), 23- 34.
- Belcher, D. (2006). Symposium on second language writing 2006: Practicing theory of second language writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5 (1), 93.
- Barks, D., & Watts, P. (2001). Textual borrowing strategies for graduate-level ESL writes In D. Belcher & C. A. Hirvela (Eds), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 Reading-Writing Connections* (p. 246-267). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for Academic Purposes, Theory, Politics, and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Bereiter, C & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Written Composition*, L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Borg, E. (2000). Citation practices in academic writing. In P. Thompson (Ed.), *Patterns and perspectives: Insights into EAO writing practices* (pp. 27-45). Reading: University of Reading Press.

- Briton et al. (1975). *Development of writing abilities (11-18)*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bruce, S.C. (1994). Research students' early experiences of dissertation literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 19 (2), 217- 229.
- Bruce, I. (2014). Expressing criticality in the literature review in research article introductions in applied linguistics and psychology. *English for Specific Purposes*, 36, 85-96.
- Bunton, D. (1998). *Linguistics and textual problems in Ph.D. and M.Phil. theses: An analysis and genre moves and metatext*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Hong Kong.
- Bunton, D. (2002). Generic moves in Ph.D. thesis introductions. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse*. (p. 57-75). London: Pearson Education.
- Canagarajah, S. (2002). Multilingual writers and the academic community: towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 29-44.
- Casanave, C. P. & Hubbard, P. (1992). The writing assignments and writing problems of doctoral students: Faculty perceptions, pedagogical issues, and needed research. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11 (1), 33-49.
- Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing Games: Multicultural Case Study of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education*. Ann Harbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Casanave, C. P. (2008). Learning participatory practices in graduate school: Some perspective-taking by a mainstream Educator. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p. 14-32). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press
- Chen, D., Wang, Y.-M. and Lee, W.C. (2015), Challenges confronting beginning researchers in conducting literature reviews, *Studies in Continuing Education*, 38 (1), 47-60.

- Costley, T. (2008). "You are beginning to sound like an academic:" Finding and owning your academic voice. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p. 74-90). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Crouch, M., & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview based qualitative research. *Social Science Information*
- Cumming, A., Lai, C, & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes. A synthesis of recent research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 47-58.
- Davis, M. (2013). The development of source use by international postgraduate students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12 (2), 125-135.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.
- Denzin N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000). *The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, 1-32.
- Dong, Y. (1996). Learning how to use citations for knowledge transformation: Non-native doctoral students' dissertation writing in science. *Research in Teaching of English*, 30, 428- 457.
- Dong, Y.R. (1998). Non-native graduate students' thesis/dissertation writing in science: self-reports by students and their advisors from two US institutions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17 (4), 369- 390.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics – Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Douglas, J. (2020). Developing an English for academic purposes for L2 graduate students in the sciences. In Brooks-Gillies et al. (Eds), *Graduate Writing across the Disciplines:*

- Identifying, teaching, and supporting* (p. 71-91). Louisville, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1999). The dissertation: the case of neglect? In P. Thompson (Ed.). *Issues in EAP research and instruction* (p. 28-36). Reading University: CALS.
- Fazel, I., & Shi, L. (2015). Citation behavior of graduate students in grant proposal writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 203-214.
- Feak, C.B., & Swales, J.M. (2009). *Telling a research story: Writing and literature review*. Ann Harbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the Non-native -Speaking scholars. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34 (1), 127-150.
- Flowerdew, J. (2015). John Swales' s approach to pedagogy in *Genre Analysis*. A perspective from 25 years on. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 19, 102-112.
- Fujioka, M. (2008). Dissertation writing and the (re) positioning of self in a “community of practice”. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p. 58- 74). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2013). Reading and writing together: A critical component of English for Academic Purposes teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, 4 (1), 9-24.
- Helin, J (2015). Writing process after reading Bakhtin. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24 (2), 174-185.
- Hidi, S., & Anderson, V. (1986). Producing written summaries: Task demands, cognitive operations, and implication for instructions. *Review of Educational Research*, 56 (4), 473-493.

- Hirvela, A. & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12 (2), 87-98.
- Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Harbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Howard, R. M. (1999). *Standing in the shadow of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivanic, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10 (1-2), 3-33.
- Johnson, L, Lee, A., & Green, B. (2000). The PhD and the autonomous self: Gender, rationality, and postgraduate pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25 (2), 135-147.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15 (4), 261-278.
- Kintsch, E. (1990). Macroprocesses and microprocesses in the development of summarization skill. *Cognition and Instruction*, 7 (3), 161-195.
- Kuwahara, N. (2008). It's not in the orientation manual: How a first-year doctoral student learned to survive in graduate school. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p.186-201). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kvale, S & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage Publications.

- Kwan, B.S.C. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral thesis of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25 (1), 30-55.
- Kwan, B.S.C. (2008). The nexus of reading, writing, and researching in doctoral undertaking of humanities and social sciences: Implications for literature review writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27 (1), 42-56.
- Kwan, B.S.C. (2009). Reading and preparation for writing a PhD thesis: Case studies of experiences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 8 (3), 180-191.
- Lave, J & Wenger, E. (2011). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.
- <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=ZVogAwAAQBAJ&pg=GBS.PT6> (Original work published 1991).
- Lavelle, E., & Bushrow, K. (2007). Writing approaches of graduate students. *Educational Psychology*, 27 (6), 807-822.
- Li, X. (2008). Learning to write a thesis with an argumentative edge. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p. 46-58). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ma, R & Qin, X. (2017). Individual factors influencing citation competence in L2 graduate writing. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 24 (2-3), 213-240.
- MacNealy, M.S. (1999). *Strategies for empirical research in writing*. New York, NY: Longman Press.
- Matsuda, P. K. & Silva, T. (2011). *Second Language Writing Research – Perspectives on the Process of Knowledge Construction*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.

- McCulloch, S. (2013). Investigating the reading-to-write processes and source use of L2 postgraduate students in real-life academic tasks: An exploratory study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 136-147.
- McDonough, K., Crawford, W., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 20-32.
- Miles, M & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded source book*. Sage Publisher.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publisher.
- Mirzaei, A., Domakani, M.R., & Heidari, N. (2014). Exploring the relationship between reading strategy use and multiple intelligences among successful L2 readers. *Educational Psychology*, 32 (2), 208-230.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38 (4), 573-603.
- Nergis, A. (2013). Exploring the factors that affect reading comprehension of EAP learners. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 1-9.
- Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organization of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 25-38.
- Paltridge, B. (2002). Thesis and dissertation writing: An examination of published advice and actual practice. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21 (2), 125-143.
- Pecorari, D. (2006). Visible and occluded citation features in post-graduate second language writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25 (1), 4-29.

- Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 149-164.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing other's words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 201- 230.
- Peters, B. (2011). Lessons about writing to learn from a university high-school partnership. *Writing Program Administration, 34* (2), 59-88.
- Petric, B. (2007). Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6*, 238-253.
- Petric, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 102-119.
- Petric, B. & Harwood, N. (2013). Task requirements, task representation, and self-reported citation functions: An exploratory study of a successful L2 student's writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*, 110-124.
- Plakans, L. (2009). The role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8* (4), 252-266.
- Plakans, L. (2010). Independent vs. integrated writing tasks: A comparison of task representation. *TESOL Quarterly, 44* (1), 185-194.
- Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing Writing 17*, 18-34.
- Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2013). Toward a transparent construct of reading-to-write tasks: The interface between discourse features and proficiency. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 10*, 9-27.

- Polio, Ch & Shi, L. (June 2012). Perceptions and beliefs about textual appropriation and source use in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21 (2), 95-101.
- Polio, Ch & Friedman, A.D. (2017). *Understanding, evaluating, and conducting second language writing research*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.
- Prior, P.A. (1998). *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Socio-historic Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Prior, P. A. & Min, Y. (2008). The lived experience of graduate work and writing: From chronotopic laminations to everyday lamentations. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p. 230-247). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Rolls, L., & Relf, M. (2006). Bracketing interviews: Addressing methodological challenges in qualitative interviewing in bereavement and palliative care. *Mortality*, 11 (3), 286-306.
- Ruiz-Funes, M. (2014). Development of EFL students' mental models of writing and their effects on performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 1-19.
- Samraj, B. (2013). Form and function of citations in discussion sections of master's theses and research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 299-310.
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21 (2), 171-200.
- Shi, L. (2006). Cultural backgrounds and textual appropriation. *Language Awareness*, 15 (4), 264-282.
- Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates, *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 1-24.

- Shi, L. (2011). Common knowledge, learning, and citation practices in university writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45, 308-334.
- Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 134-148. Ann Harbor: MI
- Simpson, S, Caplan, Cox, M & Phillips, T (2016). *Supporting graduate student writers*. Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press
- Spivey, N. (1990). Transforming texts: Constructive processes in reading and writing. *Written Communication*, 7 (2), 256-287.
- Sun, Y.C., & Yang, F. Y. (2015). Uncovering published author's text-borrowing practices: Paraphrasing strategies, sources, and self-plagiarism. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 224-236.
- Strickland, B.M. (2016). Writing for the (virtual) other: Bakhtinian intertextuality within online L2 writing exchanges. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-20.
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J.M. (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J.M., & Feak, C.B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students. Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Thompson, P. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *Language Learning and Technology*, 5(30), 91-105.

- Thompson, C., Morton, J., & Storch, N. (2013). Where from, who, why, and how? A study of the use of sources by first year L2 university students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 99-109.
- Tribble, C. (2001). Corpora and corpus analysis: New windows on academic writing. In J. Flowerdew, (Ed.), *Academic discourse*. Harlow, UK: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Turner, E & Bitchener, J (2005). Approach to teaching the writing of literature reviews. *Zeitschrift Schreiben*, 1-10.
- Yang, L., & Shi, L. (2003). Exploring six MBA students' summary writing by introspection. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2 (3), 165- 192.
- Zhang, C. (2013). Effect of instruction on ESL students' synthesis writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 51-67.
- Zhu, W., & Cheng, R. (2008). Negotiating the dissertation literature review. The influence of personal stories. In X. Li & C. P. Casanave (Eds), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic acculturation* (p. 134-149). Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Wenger, E. (2008). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.
- <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=Jb8mAAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&pg=GBS.PR5.w.4.0.0> (Original work published 1998).
- Wette, R. (2014). Teachers' practices in EAP writing instruction: Use of models and modeling. *System*, 42, 60-69.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: KWAN'S MODEL (2006)

A Move Structure for the Thematic Units in LR Chapters (Kwan, 2006, p. 51)

Moves/Strategies	Moves/Strategies Description
Move 1	Establishing one part of the territory of one's own research by
Strategy A#	surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims
Strategy B#	claiming centrality
Strategy C	surveying the research-related phenomena
Move 2	Creating a research niche (in response to Move 1) by:
Strategy A	counter-claiming
Strategy B	gap-indicating
Strategy C	asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed
Strategy D	asserting the relevancy of surveyed claims to one's own research
Strategy E	abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework
Move 3 (optional)	Occupying the research niche by announcing:
Strategy A	Research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses*
Strategy B	Theoretical positions/ theoretical framework*
Strategy C	Research design/processes*
Strategy D	Interpretations of terminology used in thesis*

*Sub-strategy: justifying or claiming contributions

#Strategy 1B tends to precede Strategy 1A when the two co-occur.

APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

Directions: Please fill out this sheet and email it to Romana Hinton (rrousko1@vols.utk.edu)

What do you like to be called? Please select a pseudonym.

Age:

First language/Native language:

Home country:

Academic History

A. Undergraduate Institution:

a. Major:

b. Minor:

C. Graduate Institution:

a. Degree:

b. Emphasis:

Do you use direct quotes in the literature review section of your thesis/dissertation?

Please describe your previous writing experience in your first language/native language. You may also include the information about the classes you have taken.

Please describe your previous writing experience in English. You may also include the information about the classes you have taken.

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL #1

Introduction: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. The interview today should last about 90 minutes, and its main purpose is to get to know your educational background, your previous experiences with writing in your first language (and English in general), your writing experience from an American post-secondary institution, your previous and recent knowledge about the genre of thesis/dissertation) and sub-genre (literature review), and about source use such as direct quoting.

Part I: Getting to know the participant (student's educational background)

1.How are you doing today?

2.How is your semester going?

3.How is your thesis/dissertation research going? Tell me about this experience so far.

Probe: How do you get any research/writing support during your thesis/dissertation writing?

What types of support (advisor, writing groups, Writing Center, etc.)

Probe: How do you deal with other departmental responsibilities (a research assistant, a teaching assistant) and writing your own thesis or dissertation?

4.Tell me more about the experience with your PhD/master's study at the U.S. university.

Probe: What has been the most challenging?

Probe: What are some differences in your PhD/master's study at the U.S. university and at the university in your home country?

5.Why did you choose the path of writing a thesis or a dissertation in your discipline?

Part II. Previous writing experiences in student's first language and in English

1.Tell me about your general writing experience in your first language.

Probe: Did you take any writing classes in your secondary and postsecondary education in your country? Tell me about them.

Probe: How did you learn about writing in your language in other classes besides Language/Writing classes? Tell me about this experience.

2.How did you learn to write academic papers in your first language?

Probe: Did you learn it from the professors in your discipline?

Probe: What classes did you take about academic writing in your first language?

3.How did you learn to write in English in your country? Tell me more about it.

Probe: What types of classes did you take?

Probe: What types of writing did you learn in these classes?

4.How did you learn about academic writing in English? Tell me more about this experience.

5.How did you learn about English writing in your discipline? Tell me about it.

Probe: Did you take English writing classes in your own discipline?

- Probe: How were you taught English writing in your own discipline in your own country?
6. What did you learn about English writing in your own discipline in your own country?
7. How prepared did you feel about your writing in English before you came to the USA? Tell me about it.
8. Have you already published something in your first language or English? Tell more about it.

Part III. Writing experiences from the American post-secondary institution

1. How did you learn to write when you started your PhD/master's study. Tell me about this experience.
- Probe: What classes did you take?
- Probe: What writing support did you have? (Writing groups, colleagues, professors, Writing center)
- Probe: How often did you discuss your writing with your advisor?
- Probe: In which scholarly activities (conferences, co-publishing with your colleagues/advisors) at the department or outside your own department are you involved?
2. How did you feel about your writing after receiving writing support such as Writing center, writing classes, and advisor?
3. How do you feel about your writing now?

Part IV. Knowledge of Genre (Thesis/Dissertation) and Sub-genre (literature review)

1. How did you learn to write a thesis or a dissertation?
- Probe: How much preparation about thesis/dissertation writing did you receive from your advisor?
- Probe: How helpful were the writing classes or any writing support in this?
- Probe: Did you look at some theses/dissertations before you started writing your thesis/dissertation?
2. What did you learn about a thesis or a dissertation in your writing classes and in your discipline?
3. How different is the whole process of writing thesis/dissertation at a U.S. university from the university at your home country?
4. How were you taught to write literature reviews in theses/dissertations at a U.S.?
- Probe: How often was writing literature reviews covered in your writing classes?
- Probe: What did you learn about writing literature reviews in your writing classes?
- Probe: Where did you learn to write a literature review?
- Probe: How helpful has your advisor been during your time writing the literature review.
5. Tell me more about overall experiences writing literature reviews.

Part V. A source use/Direct Quoting

1. Tell me about your experience with using scholarly sources in writing in your first language.

2. Tell me about your experience with using scholarly sources in English.

Probe: How did you learn to use sources in your writing?

3. What and how did you learn about citations in your discipline?

4. What did you learn about direct quoting?

5. How were you taught to direct quote?

6. How do you incorporate direct quotes into your writing?

Probe: How do you begin?

Probe: What are your writing and reading strategies?

7. How do you decide when and where to incorporate direct quote into the literature review?

8. Why do you decide to direct quote above paraphrasing and summarizing?

9. When do you quote directly?

10. What are the challenges when you quote?

11. What do you like about using direct quotes?

12. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL # 2

Introduction: Thank you for meeting with me for this second interview. This interview today should last 90 minutes. In this text-based interview, I will ask you questions related to the literature review that you submitted a few days before this interview. I also asked you to reread your literature review right before this interview (Odell et al., 1983). After we discuss the text, there will be a few follow-up questions that will ask you to reflect on your experience using quotes and writing literature review.

Part I: Text-based interview

1. Tell me about your experiences writing this draft of the literature review.

Probe: How did it go?

2. Walk me through this paper.

Probe: What are you trying to say and how are you trying to say it?

3. Tell me more about the structure of this literature review.

Probe: Why did you structure your literature review this way?

4. Can you point to a specific section where the writing was easy?

5. Why do you think that section was easy to write?

6. Can you point to a specific section where the writing was difficult?

7. Why do you think that section was hard to write?

8. Tell me about the direct quotes in your literature review.

Probe: Why do you use direct quotes in your writing?

Probe: How do you keep your own voice even you decide to use direct quotes?

Probe: How difficult is it to keep your own voice in your writing?

9. This quote seems to be very long. Could you explain me why you decided to use this long quote instead of a shorter quote?

Probe: Why did you decide to place this quote in this part of the text?

Probe: How did you incorporate this quote into the text?

Probe: How much did you pay attention to the context of your study when you decided to quote?

Probe: How did you select this quote above the other interesting quotes from your sources?

10. In this part of the text, why did you decide to quote instead of paraphrase or summarize?

Part II. Follow-up questions that reflect on student's experience of direct quoting in the literature review

1. How has your confidence in writing changed?

2. How did your experience with writing thesis change?

3. What have you learned from writing a literature review?

4. Did you receive any writing support such as an advisor, a PhD. colleague, Writing Center, a writing group, etc. when you wrote this literature review?

Probe: How often did you meet with your advisor, a writing group, a PhD. colleague, etc.?

Probe: What did you learn from these meetings?

Probe: How beneficial were these meetings for writing your literature review and learning about direct quoting in your literature review?

5. How have your reading and writing strategies for direct quoting changed since you started writing your literature review?

6. How have you improved your direct quoting skills?

7. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share?

APPENDIX E: PETRIC'S TAXONOMY OF RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS (2007)

Petric 's taxonomy of rhetorical functions (2007)

Attribution:

This type of citation is used to attribute information or activity to an author. The attributed information may be a proposition, a term, or a stretch of text, while the activity may be a research, discourse or cognitive act. This type of citation can be realized as a summary/paraphrase or quotation. Any type of surface form of citation, i.e., integral or non-integral, reporting or non-reporting, can be used to express attribution.

Exemplification:

The citation, usually preceded by “for example” or “e.g.,” provides information on the source(s) illustrating the writer’s statement. Both integral and non-integral citations can have this rhetorical function. This type of citation can be effectively used to fulfil the first requirement for a good thesis, i.e., showing the knowledge of the literature in the field, since it can be used to create a link between general trends and the work of individual authors. The citation functions as specific evidence supporting a more general claim and thus contributes to the writer’s argumentation.

Further reference:

The citation, usually in parentheses or a footnote and preceded by “see,” refers to works providing further information on the issue.

Statement of use:

This type of citation is used to state what works are used in the thesis and for what purposes. It is found either in introductions and introductory paragraphs in chapters as a statement of prospective use or in conclusions or summaries of chapters as a statement of retrospective use. Both integral and non-integral citations can have this function. In both cases, it is the writer’s authorial decisions that are in the foreground.

Application:

This type of citation makes connections between the cited and the writer’s work in order to use the arguments, concepts, terminology or procedures from the cited work for the writer’s own purposes. The focus is therefore on the writer’s work.

Evaluation:

In this type of citation, the work of another author is evaluated by the use of evaluative language ranging from individual words (e.g., evaluative adverbs) to clauses expressing evaluation.

Establishing links between sources:

The function of this citation is to point to links, usually comparison and contrast, between or among different sources used. This type of citation can be used to indicate differences in existing views on a topic, thus showing that the writer is able to identify controversial issues, which is particularly important in discursive fields. This category also includes cases where a common statement is attributed to a group of studies or authors, followed by a list of citations (Hyland, 2000, refers to this type of citation as generalization from multiple sources). This type of citation attests to the writer's ability to detect what is considered common knowledge in the field.

Comparison of one's own findings or interpretation with other sources:

This type of citation is used to indicate similarities or differences between one's own work and the works of other authors, typically when discussing the findings. This citation type plays an important role in fulfilling the thesis requirement of contribution to the field, since contribution needs to be differentiated from previous work.

Other:

This category includes cases where the relationship between the citing sentence and the citation is obscure.

APPENDIX F: CODING SCHEMES FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED AND TEXT-BASED INTERVIEWS

RQ 1: How do L2 graduate students learn to use direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations?

1. What L2 Graduate Students Learn about Source Use in Literature Reviews in Their Home Countries

- A. Learning in formal teaching settings in students' own countries
- B. Learning outside of teaching settings in students' own countries

2. How L2 graduate students learn about literature reviews of theses and dissertations at U.S. universities

- A. Learning in informal teaching settings at U.S. universities (Learning from working with a thesis/dissertation advisor)
- B. Learning in formal teaching settings at U.S. universities (Graduate Writing courses specifically designed for L2 graduate students and Graduate coursework)

RQ 2: How do L2 graduate students use sources, particularly direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations?

1. What L2 Graduate Students Do When They Use Sources, Including, Direct Quotes in Literature Reviews

- A. Reading to learn to learn to write in direct quotes

RQ 3: To what extent does an understanding of use of direct quotes in literature reviews of theses and dissertations help L2 graduate students to establish themselves as members of their disciplines?

- 1. How L2 graduate students' conceptual understanding of literature reviews and direct quoting impact their use of direct quotes and the way they establish themselves as members of their disciplines**

A. Reading to Learn to Write Embedded Literature Reviews of Theses and Dissertations

APPENDIX G: CODING SCHEMES FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED AND TEXT-BASED INTERVIEWS

1. What L2 Graduate Students Learn about Source Use in Literature Reviews in Their Home Countries

Please put a plus sign to indicate evidence/examples for each category.

Name	1*	2*
(pseudonym)		
Sara		
Joice		
Nathan		
Ernest		

*1= Learning in formal teaching settings in students' own countries; 2= Learning outside of teaching settings in students' own counties

2. How L2 graduate students learn about literature reviews of theses and dissertations at U.S. universities

Please put a plus sign to indicate evidence/examples for each category.

Name	1*	2*
(pseudonym)		
Sara		
Joice		
Nathan		
Ernest		

*1= Learning in informal teaching settings at U.S. universities (Learning from working with a thesis/dissertation advisor); 2= Learning in formal teaching settings at U.S. universities

3. What L2 Graduate Students Do When They Use Sources, Particularly Direct Quotes in Literature Reviews

Please put a plus sign to indicate evidence/examples for each category.

Name	1*	2*	3*	4*
(pseudonym)				
Sara				
Joice				
Nathan				
Ernest				

*1= Reading to learn to learn to write in direct quotes

4. How L2 graduate students' conceptual understanding impacts their use of direct quotes and the way to become more experienced members of their disciplines

Please put a plus sign to indicate evidence/examples for each category.

Name	1*
(pseudonym)	
Sara	
Joice	
Nathan	
Ernest	

*1= Reading to Learn to Write Embedded Literature Reviews of Theses and Dissertations

APPENDIX H: INFORMED CONSENT FOR STUDENTS

The Use of Direct Quotes in the Literature Reviews of Masters' Theses and Doctoral Dissertations: A Qualitative Case Study of International Graduate Students

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in the study that seeks to understand the usage of direct quotes in the literature review sections of masters' theses and/or doctoral dissertations among international graduate students at the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The aim of the study is to investigate the usage of direct quotes from students' reading and writing knowledge, discourse community knowledge, structural knowledge of literature reviews, and direct quotes' rhetorical functions in literature reviews. This study consists of semi-structured interviews, text-based interviews along with follow-up questions, and textual analysis of literature review drafts.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY

You will participate in one semi-structured interview that will last 90 minutes at the end of Spring semester 2019 or summer semester 2019. This interview will reflect on your previous experience with academic writing, and specifically with direct quoting in your first language and English. The interview questions will also try to elicit the information about the knowledge of genre (thesis and dissertation) and subgenre (literature review) you are writing. A few weeks after the semi-structured interview, I will collect your literature review drafts. They will be emailed to me in the electronic version and I will analyze them with a second coder, Hannah Soblo (first year PhD. student in Rhetoric and Writing at the University of Tennessee). A few days after analyzing your text, I will hold one text-based interview that will last 90 minutes. In order to prepare for this interview, I will ask you to bring the hard-copy of your literature review draft. I will ask you to reread your draft right before your interview. You will have a chance to reflect on the experience of writing your draft. I will also ask you a few questions related to some specific parts of the text where direct quotes were used. This interview will also have a few follow-up questions that will reflect on your overall experiences with direct quoting and writing literature review sections.

The interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed. The audio recordings will only be saved until the transcriptions are complete and, at that time, they will be deleted. The electronic version of literature review drafts, its analysis, and the hard-copy of your literature review will be kept securely locked in the researcher's advisor's office at the University of Tennessee following the conclusion of the study.

RISKS

Loss of confidentiality is a possible risk to participation in this study. Most research involves some risk to confidentiality, but the researchers believe this risk is minimal because of the procedures used to protect participant information.

BENEFITS

You may not directly benefit from your participation in this research study. This research is of benefit to the fields of composition and second language writing by providing up-to-date information and relevant data on source use (direct quoting) among international graduate students. It is also of benefit to graduate programs across disciplines, as writing skills, particular among the international graduate student populations, deserve more scholarship and research. The benefits for the participants will be the opportunity to reflect on their own experiences as scholars entering their own disciplines. Their contribution and input will add to a growing academic discussion about writing practices among international graduate students. The results of my study will also add to the scarce scholarship on teaching practices of direct quoting.

COMPENSATION

Each participant will receive up to two \$25 gift cards (a total of \$50 in gift cards) to either Amazon or Starbucks. These gift cards will be prorated based on completion of scheduled interviews. The first gift card will be \$25 and will be given after the completion of the first interview. After completing the second interview sometimes in February, participants will receive another \$25 gift card.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The information in the study records will be kept confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless participants specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link participants to the study. Your research information will not be used or shared with other researchers for future research, even if identifiers are removed.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have questions at any time about the study, you may contact Romana Hinton at 301 McClung Tower, rrousco1@vols.utk.edu, or the faculty advisor Dr. Tanita Saenkhum, at 301 McClung Tower, tsaenkhum@utk.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of Tennessee IRB Compliance Officer at utkirb@utk.edu or (865)974-7697.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study prior to compensation, all data collected will be returned to you or destroyed. If you withdraw from the study and have received partial compensation, Romana Hinton will retain and use all data collected from the compensated period of participation.

CONSENT

I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's Name (print): _____

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

I agree that this interview will be recorded.

Participant's Signature: _____ Date _____

Investigator's Signature: _____ Date _____

VITA

Romana Hinton earned her doctoral degree in English in the Rhetoric, Writing, and Linguistics program at the University of Tennessee, where she specialized in second language writing.